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The following acronyms are used throughout the dissertation, listed here for easy reference:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Native Language of the learner(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSs</td>
<td>Native Speakers of a Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNSs</td>
<td>Non-Native Speakers of a Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCT</td>
<td>Discourse Completion Task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDCT</td>
<td>Multiple-Choice Discourse Completion Task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDCT</td>
<td>Written Discourse Completion Task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFL</td>
<td>English as a Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Interlanguage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILP</td>
<td>Interlanguage Pragmatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Second/Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Communicative Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Pragmatic Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLA</td>
<td>Second Language Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL</td>
<td>Test of English as a Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IELTS</td>
<td>International English Language Testing System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Social Distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Size of Imposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJT</td>
<td>Appropriateness Judgment Task</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Definition of Terms:
This section presents the most significant terms used throughout the study:

Interlanguage (IL):
Selinker (1972, 1992) defines Interlanguage as L2 learners’ developing TL knowledge.

Interlanguage Pragmatics (ILP):
Kasper and Dahl (1991: 216) explain Interlanguage Pragmatics as “non-native speakers’ comprehension and production of speech acts and how the L2 speech act related knowledge is acquired.

Communicative Competence (CC):
Savignon (1978: 12, as cited in Paulston, 1992: 98) defines CC as “Linguistic interaction in the target language: the ability to function in a truly communicative setting; that is in a spontaneous transaction involving one or more persons.”

Pragmatic competence (PC):
Koike (1989: 279) refers to PC as “the speaker’s knowledge and use of rules of appropriateness and politeness, which dictate the way the speaker will understand and formulate speech acts.” Pragmalinguistic competence and the sociopragmatic competence are two aspects of PC.

Pragmalinguistic competence:
Leech (1983: 11) states they are “the particular resources which a language provides for conveying a particular illocution.” Kasper and Rose (2001: 3) attest it requires mapping form, meaning, force and sometimes context, as in the use of pragmatic strategies, pre-packaged routines, hedging and indirectness to intensify or soften the communicative intent.
Sociopragmatic competence:
Thomas (1983: 91) defines sociopragmatic competence to be largely concerned with the sociological interface of the language; she states that it involves the learners’ system of beliefs as well as their knowledge of the language. Harlow (1990: 1) refers to it as the “ability to vary speech act strategies according to the situational variables in the act of communication.”

Pragmatic Perception/Recognition:
It is the ability to make sound judgment of the speaker's intended illocutionary force of utterances.

Pragmatic failure:
Thomas (1983: 91) refers to pragmatic failure as the “inability to perceive or produce utterances that represent a speaker intended illocutionary force”.

Appropriateness:
As mentioned in Blum-Kulka et al. (1989), appropriateness has been equated with NSs’ use and/or production in ELT pedagogy.

Speech acts:
Searle (1969:16) describes Speech acts as the “basic or minimal units of linguistic communication.”

Request:
Trosborg (1995: 237) defines request as a directive speech act in which the “speaker asks the hearer to perform an action which is for the exclusive benefit of the speaker.”
**Requestive strategy:**

Eslami and Noora (2008: 310) define the requestive strategy as “the pragmalinguistic convention by which the request is realized.”

**Politeness:**

Brown and Levinson (1987: 91) attest politeness is “a mixture of formal as well as functional features accompanying inherently face-threatening speech act, such as requests, in order to minimise their threat.” It involves “the public self-image that every member [of a society] wants to claim for himself.” They recognise that “everyone has similar face wants and they distinguish between two aspects of face that they claim to be universal: positive and negative.”

**Face-threatening acts (FTAs):**

Brown and Levinson (1987: 65) describe FTAs as “the acts which run contrary to the addressee’s self-image.”

**Social distance:**

Brown and Levinson (1987: 76) state that “symmetric social dimension of similarity/difference within which the interlocutors stand for the purpose of an act and material/non-material goods exchanged between them.”

**Social power:**

Brown and Levinson (1987: 77) define social power as “the degree to which the hearer can impose his own plans and his own self-evaluation (i.e. face) at the expense of the speaker’s plans and self-evaluation.”
**Discourse Completion Task (DCT):**

Varghese and Billmyer (1996: 40) describe DCT as “a questionnaire containing a set of briefly described situations designed to elicit a particular speech act.”

**Learning:**

Learning has been operationalised as the change in the learners’ pragmatic competence or knowledge from the pre-instruction to the post-instruction.

**English as a foreign language (EFL):**

It refers to the learning of English while the learner is residing in his or her own native country, not in that of the target culture.
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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to investigate the role of pragmatics instruction on English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners’ perception and production of requests as well as exploring the learners' attitudes towards their target language (TL) learning experience. Informed by Schmidt’s Noticing Hypothesis (1993,1995,2001) as the theoretical framework, this study was carried out to examine the role and the effect of pragmatic intervention in raising the learners' awareness and sensitising them towards pragmatic aspects of target language in EFL Contexts. Forty-four EFL undergraduate Egyptian participants who share one common first language background, Egyptian Arabic, received 10-week of instruction using informed eclectic model of pragmatic instruction. The instruction involved metapragmatic information consolidated with meaningful practice, along with awareness raising techniques using proactive typographical input enhancement. Using a pre-and post-intervention design with two experimental groups, learners’ recognition and production of the target speech act were evaluated through Multiple-choice Discourse Completion Task (MDCT) and Written Discourse Completion Task (WDCT), respectively. Data concerning the learners’ attitudes were gathered using four self-reported diaries. Data were analysed quantitatively and qualitatively using statistical, quantitative approaches for the former and a pre-determined framework adapted from Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) for the latter. Grounded theory and qualitative approaches of analysis were employed to chart the learners’ burgeoning pragmatic awareness and their attitudes towards target language learning experience. Findings showed that learners were able to achieve statistically significant gains in their pragmatic perception and awareness on the post-intervention MDCT. Following the instructional phase, participants demonstrated significant improvement in their production of request forms. Results evinced significant increase in the variety and appropriate use of internal and external modifications as well as apparent decrease in the learners’ use of direct request strategies in the post-intervention productions. However, few strategies were seen to be inappropriately applied in few situations in the WDCT responses. Most of the learners were also noted to embrace a positive attitude towards the TL learning experience with varying degrees. The majority of the learners were able to identify and manage the affective barriers that seemed to impede their language learning; however, quite a few were still challenged. These findings suggest the strong instructional role of pragmatic instruction on the learners’ learning of request-making expressions and forms beneficially. This study contributes to the interventional and the developmental research in L2 pragmatics by exploring three layers of knowledge, with special emphasis on the interplay between pragmatics competence and the learners’ voice.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.0. Introduction:
With globalisation and rapid economic development, there has been a worldwide increasing demand for effective communication in the English language. Being multilingual is becoming a strategic investment that people from all walks of life have been expending their time, their effort and their riches to realise. To communicate with people of other nationalities, cultures and linguistic backgrounds is a remarkable feat. It involves acquiring a second/foreign language (L2), comprehending and being understood in communication and interaction. Adopting a communicative approach to achieve this undertaking has placed more emphasis on achieving the functional component of the L2 along with its linguistic component. Kasper and Roever (2005) along with Deda (2013) argue language learners do not only have to develop their linguistic competence, but also their pragmatic competence which refers to the function and the use of the language. Language is a complex system that is used basically for communication. Whong (2011: 1) defines language as two complementary terms: 'language as form' and 'language as function'. The former is concerned with the structures of the language and the latter is interested in what the language does, to enhance interaction among people. Due to the intricacy of the processes involved, acquiring L2 by adult learners is considered a daunting venture. Thus, a greater understanding and a thorough investigation of these processes and their attributed features will definitely be supportive to effective L2 learning.
1.1. Applied Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition:

Current research in second language acquisition (SLA) and pedagogy draws heavily on theories of linguistics and their applications, which applied linguistics as a sub-field has embraced in various areas such as phonology, semantics, syntax, morphology and pragmatics. Kramsch (2000) points out that in Europe in the late 1950s, linguists and educators founded applied linguistics as an interdisciplinary field of investigation for the study of all facets of language use. Schmitt and Celce-Murcia (2002: 1) define applied linguistics as “using what we know about (a) language, (b) how it is learned, and (c) how it is used, in order to achieve some purpose or solve some problem in the real world”. Harris (2001) states that applied linguistics has essentially researched the practical area of L2 teaching and learning. Hence, applied linguistics empirically investigates language and language problems as a central issue in its purview of research. It is a field that brings theory and practice of language acquisition as well as their use together, to illuminate the teaching and learning of L2 learning and acquisition. It is worth mentioning that throughout this study, language learning and language acquisition are used interchangeably to mean one and the same mode of foreign language development rather than the acquisition/learning hypothesis proposed by Krashen (1981). It is assumed that this dichotomy of learning and acquisition as two different processes and modes of L2 development does not relate to the context of this study, because it involves a foreign language context in which acquisition as a natural subconscious process or informal mode of learning is invalid where no target language (TL) immersion is expected to be at play. Therefore, language learning and language acquisition refer to the same concept of formal and explicit learning of a foreign language.
With the mounting need to teach English as an L2, with the rapidly growing group of immigrants and guest workers after the second world war (Ellis, 1990), SLA research emerged in the early 1970s. As a field of inquiry, SLA has gained insights from a matrix of fields in psychology, sociology, as well as education particularly for its significant pedagogical implications for language teaching and learning. Thus, SLA encompasses issues related to the learning and teaching L2 with a special focus on the cognitive and the social issues of the language. According to Kramsch (2000: 314) it explores “the nature of the learning environments, classrooms, curricula…the effects of social identity, schooling and cultural integration on the learning and teaching of foreign language learning.”

1.1.1. Second/Foreign Language Teaching Approaches:
On reviewing the literature of SLA, it can be inferred that L2 instruction has fluctuated in underlying aims and beliefs between getting learners to speak and understand L2 rather than getting them to learn its grammatical rules. These swings of the pendulum have gone on over the centuries: since the early 19th century, with Karl Ploetz (1881) and the emergence of the Grammar-Translation language teaching approach, until the 20th century with Hymes (1967, 1972), Halliday, (1973) and Savignon, (1972) who developed Communicative Competence (CC) and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach. Since then, the emphasis of L2 teaching has oscillated between teaching language analysis to teaching language utility according Celce-Murcia (2001). As a reaction to the impracticalities and inadequacies of the earlier language teaching approaches including the Grammar-Translation approach, the Audio-Lingual approach, the Cognitive approach, and the Comprehension-Based approach, the CLT approach came to existence (Richards, 2006; Celce-Murcia, 2001). Language in the CLT
approach has been viewed as a system for communication, where the language learner has been perceived as “someone who thinks, feels, understands, and has something to say” (Celce-Murcia, 2001: 9). The focus of language study, thus, has shifted to utility. It focuses on communication using the target language (TL), authentic language in real-life situations, and integrated skills; rather than using imitation, repetition, with little use of the TL, meanwhile focusing on grammatical parsing. It is a shift away from the Grammar-Translation and the Audio-Lingual language teaching approaches, which failed to produce learners who could communicate, to the CLT approach, to an approach which considers language to be a ‘system for communication.’ (Celce-Murcia, 2001: 8).

Gass and Selinker (2001), reiterated by Jung (2002), Lin et al. (2009) and later by Taguchi (2012) among others, claim that language learning involves the ability to express communicative needs, hence the emphasis on communication has been at the heart of language learning and acquisition. Savignon (1972, 2001), Celce-Murcia (2001), Brown (2007), and Sun (2013) hold the view that one of the first and foremost goals of language teaching is the learner’s ability to communicate using the TL, and that CC can to be considered the overall objective of all language classroom teaching, learning and assessment. Consequently, it is necessary for instruction to direct itself towards all its components (Savignon, 2007; Celce-Murcia, 2001). In a similar vein, Cook (2013:49) maintains “language teaching should aim at creating successful L2 users”, which corresponds to people who can function in two cultures with different L1s (Cook, 2013, 2016). Brown (2001: 68) opines giving due attention to appropriate
language use, to authentic language and contexts rather than just language usage and accuracy will definitely boost the achievement of the communicative goals in a classroom which will enable learners "to apply classroom learning to previously unrehearsed contexts in the real world outside of the classroom". Thus, these learners are likely to become effective and successful users of the language. Wolfson (1983) remarks that L2 learners would not be able to communicate appropriately and effectively with their native speakers' (NSs') counterparts unless, they master the culture-bound rules of the TL.

1.1.2. Communicative Competence and the Inception of Pragmatic Competence:
A strong theoretical impetus was offered by Social Sciences and Humanities for the emergence and the development of CLT approach in SLA and pedagogy almost more than forty-five years ago in reaction to Grammar-Translation and Audio-Lingual approaches to language pedagogy. Communicative competence (CC) as a term and concept was motivated by Hymes (1967,1972) and the various notions of Habermas (1979, 1984) as well as other researchers including Canale and Swain (1980); Canale (1983, 1984, 1987); Bachman (1990); Celce-Murcia et al. (1995, 1998); Bachman and Palmer (1996); and Celce-Murcia (2007). The anthropological linguist Dell Hymes (1967,1972) puts forward the notion of CC in response to Noam Chomsky’s (1957,1965) theories which focus solely on linguistic competence where he claims that any consideration of social parameters falls outside the domain of linguistics. Hymes (1972) argues that it is not only linguistic competence that one needs to account for in language acquisition and language use, but also concepts of sociolinguistic competence (the rules for using language appropriately in context).
Adopting Hymes’ perspective, Canale and Swain (1980: 9) add *strategic competence* to the linguistic competence and sociolinguistic competence proposed by Hymes (1972). In fact, they offer a comprehensive review and a widely accepted framework of CC involving three essential components namely, grammatical, sociolinguistic, and strategic competences which has its associated applications in applied linguistics and language pedagogy. To them, the grammatical competence refers to the grammatical rules in interpretation, expression, or negotiation of meaning; the verbal or the nonverbal linguistic code. The strategic competence refers to the coping strategies that are used in unfamiliar contexts or when there is a lack of competence in one of the components of CC. Lastly, the sociolinguistic competence has to do with the social rules of appropriateness of language use and the social context in which the language is used.

More recently, many applied linguists and researchers contribute to the further development of the concept of CC. Among these scholars are Canale and Swain (1980, 1981) who further develop sociolinguistic competence to include *discourse competence*. Bagarić (2007: 97) states that Canale and Swain define grammatical competence in their framework as involving the knowledge and the skills of the language that are needed for the comprehension and the production of the literal meaning of utterances. They also highlight sociolinguistic competence as “the knowledge of rules and conventions, which govern the appropriate language use and comprehension in the various sociolinguistic and sociocultural contexts”. Lastly, they describe strategic competence as the verbal and non-verbal communication strategies that are used to:

…compensate for breakdowns in communication due to insufficient competence in one or more components of communicative competence. These strategies include paraphrase, circumlocution, repetition, reluctance, avoidance of words, structures or themes, guessing, changes of register and style, modifications of messages etc.  

In spite of the fact that *pragmatic ability* is not incorporated in this model as a separate entity, *sociolinguistic competence* involves this *pragmatic ability* as one of its aspects, the rules of language use. To make amends for its absence, later, Canale (1983, 1984) reformulates this original framework by extending it to embrace a fourth aspect, *discourse competence* which refers to “the mastery of rules that determine ways in which forms and meanings are combined to achieve a meaningful unity of spoken or written texts.” (cited in Bagarić, 2007: 97) They demonstrate that discourse competence involves the means for achieving coherence in meaning and cohesion in form. This framework has been further developed by Bachman (1990) to include *pragmatic competence* as a main component to *communicative competence* (see Kasper, 1996); however, his model has been developed with language assessment in mind, rather than language teaching. In line with Bachman’s model (1990: 87), Canale has further enhanced his definition of *pragmatic competence* (PC) by assuming two other features, “*sociolinguistic competence*” and “*illocutionary competence*”, which are two constructs he defines as essential elements of his proposed definition of CC. The former feature refers to “the culturally related aspects of the language” as for instance formality and politeness, whereas the latter denotes “understanding the functional aspects of the language” (Hasbun, 2004: 264). Kasper (1996) as well as Bachman and Palmer (1996) along with other researchers have maintained this model until the present time. According to Canale and Swain (1980), the successful acquisition of CC by English as a Foreign Language or English as Second Language (EFL/ESL) learners includes, among others, the successful attainment of grammatical, sociolinguistic (pragmatic knowledge), and strategic competences. In the mid 1990s, Celce-Murcia and Celce-Murcia *et al.*
(1995, cited in Celce-Murcia, 2007: 42) proposed the actional competence, “the ability to comprehend and produce all significant speech acts and speech act sets should be part of communicative competence.” One of Celce-Murcia’s important contributions in 1995 is that she emphasises the interrelated nature of all the components of CC, the fact that all its components interact together. With more refinement, she redefines her constructs by adding subtler details in 2007. Concurring with Bachman’s model (1990), PC is not secondary to knowledge of grammar and text organisation; in fact, to communicate successfully in a TL, PC in L2 must be reasonably well developed. Kasper (1997a: 3) reiterates PC corresponds to and interacts with this linguistic knowledge in complex ways. Hence, pragmatic knowledge is principally considered an essential component of CC, on a par with other linguistic areas such phonology, semantics and syntax, grammatical competence.

In a similar vein, Savignon (1972, 1997) argues that pragmatic ability is situated in the model of communicative ability because it is part of non-native speakers’ CC in a second or foreign language (L2) acquisition and learning. Conferring with Savignon’s, Bachman’s (1990, 2000) and Bachman and Palmers’ (1996, 2010) model of CC, PC is considered one of the two main components of language competence. Kasper and Rose (2002); Eslami-Resekh (2005); Mirzaei and Esmaeili (2013) along with other researchers, debate that for a L2 language learner to communicate appropriately in a TL, their PC in the L2 must be reasonably well-developed. Along the same lines, Thomas (1983); Rose and Kasper (2001); Kasper and Rose (2002); Schauer (2009); Alcón-Soler (2012) expound a strong case for the former argument stating that learners
of a L2 should be able to **comprehend** what is being said and also **produce** utterances that are regarded as contextually appropriate and acceptable by their target community to be able communicate effectively and successfully with members of this community.

1.2. Second Language Acquisition and Interlanguage Pragmatics:
Belonging to two disciplines, interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) is defined by Schauer (2009: 15) as an area in linguistics that is situated at the intersection of SLA research and pragmatics research, both of which are interdisciplinatory. Being on a par with phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, lexis, pragmatics is a branch of the study of non-native speakers’ (NNSs’) use and acquisition of L2. Long (1996) and Tomlin (1990) argue that pragmatic knowledge is referred to as ILP just like other areas of specialisation within SLA, juxtaposing IL phonology, morphology, syntax, and lexis. Kasper and Rose (2002: 5) explain that ILP examines how NNSs comprehend and produce action in a TL. In other words, it investigates how L2 learners develop the ability to understand and perform action in a TL. Thus, both production and comprehension are integral parts of language learners’ pragmatic competence in their L2, which would be this study’s two dependent variables. The current study aims to explore the learners’ perception and production in the pre-and the post-intervention stages coupled with investigating their voice (see Chapter 3). Exploring all three: **perception, production, and voice** (attitude), this research pioneers in ILP by investigating these three layers of knowledge together (**researcher’s emphasis**).
1.2.1. Pragmatics:
Late in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century after linguistics has come to prominence, pragmatics developed as an identifiable branch of linguistics: it emerged as a field of study in the 1970s and it became well established in the 1980s. Pragmatics is an outgrowth of language study, which is specifically concerned with the speaker, the hearer and the context (O'Keefe \textit{et al.}, 2011). Pragmatics is identified and defined by many applied linguists, educators and researchers from a variety of perspectives (Schauer, 2009; Yule, 1996; Grundy, 1995).

It has been widely recognised that the field of pragmatics does not exclusively explore language in its own right like phonology, morphology, syntax or semantics; in fact, it involves "communicators (speaker-producers and hearer-interpreters at the same time) manipulate language to shape and infer meaning in a socio-cultural context" (Kecskes, 2013: 23). Furthermore, Chapman (2011:11) argues pragmatics investigates "production and interpretation of language in relation to contexts of use." Similarly, Thomas (2006: 92) refers to pragmatics as the study of 'meaning in use', which is concerned with how language is actually used by NSs to perform diverse functions in interaction. These include: how politeness is conveyed, how speech acts are realised, the effect of the grammatical structure of an utterance on its degree of directness, and "utterance interpretation" of the intent. Schauer (2009: 22) contends pragmatics is a relatively young linguistic discipline since it has begun to establish itself as an independent area of linguistic inquiry only about 45 years ago. It has been defined in various ways by numerous authors some endeavouring to restrict it to the linguistic matters only whereas others attempt to put it down to the sociocultural context. This study endeavours to seek an inclusive perspective of pragmatics. Putting it altogether,
Crystal (1997: 301) argues that pragmatics is “the study of communicative action in its sociocultural context” proposing that pragmatics is “the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication.” He emphasises that pragmatics includes those “factors that govern our choice of language in social interaction and the effects of our choice on others” (1997: 120). Hence, “the coding and the decoding of utterances by speakers and hearers” is at the heart of defining pragmatics, according to Schauer (2009: 23). Due to the subtlety of the variance among these definitions, they all tend to furnish more or less similar sense, which corresponds with the meaning of pragmatics, expressed in this research, Crystal’s (1997) can be considered the most illustrative, that is why it will be the mainstay of this study.

1.3. Statement of the problem:
Due to the dramatic increase in the amount of communication among individuals of different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, CC has been extensively required among people in a multiplicity of countries in the world. Therefore, governments and institutions of higher education have appreciated that a better quality of L2 education is becoming an exigency. This can be seen in a country like Egypt. With the increase in international investments, the growth of multinational companies, as well as the heightened pursuit of Egyptians seeking to proceed with higher education studies abroad and the variety of possible valuable academic and professional opportunities, communicating effectively using the TL becomes essential. Thus, developing the learners’ ability to achieve their learning objectives, to become effective users and communicators of the TL, should come as a top priority and instruction should be directed towards these communicative
goals. Learners aim at using the TL for effective communication in order to compete successfully in the global job market and to achieve such invaluable academic and professional opportunities. Aiming at improving the current practices in foreign language teaching and learning, this research employs a personal attempt to better understand and evaluate the phenomenon at hand, in order to apply the obtained outcomes to improve practice.

NSs can easily draw on their linguistic and sociocultural knowledge to communicate their needs and achieve their communicative goals appropriately for a given context. On the contrary, most L2 learners have limited resources, linguistic and sociocultural knowledge in a TL, with which they communicate their communicative needs. Thus, their utterances may be inappropriate for the interlocutor(s) as well as the context due to their failure to observe the contextual parameters of the context. Their lack of pragmatic awareness in L2 will cause consequential violations of the culture-specific rules of TL community which are bound to bring about serious repercussions and a number of communication problems encouraging further disparity among individuals and communities (Taguchi, 2011, 2014; Bardovi-Harlig, 2012, 2016; Pearson, 2006; Barron, 2003; Rose & Kasper, 2001). These problems could range from communication breakdown to reinforcing stereotypical labelling of L2 users as individuals who are impervious, rude, or inept (Thomas, 1983, 1984), which is likely to have detrimental impact on their progress. To illustrate, these deleterious consequences may involve denying them valuable academic or professional knowledge and opportunities that range from international policy up to interpersonal interaction among friends (Reza &
Alikhani, 2016; Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015; Wyner & Cohen, A., 2015; Rose, 2005; Kasper & Rose, 2002). This is an issue that will be carefully addressed in the proposed study.

1.4. Rationale for the Study: The Need for Instructional Intervention in EFL Contexts:
Kasper (1997a) attests raising learners’ pragmatic awareness has become one of the main goals in the EFL classroom, and many researchers have been concerned with the ‘teachability’ of different pragmatic aspects. Rose (2005); Alcón-Soler and Martínez-Flor (2008); Bardovi-Harlig (2013, 2016) among others argue a need for instructional intervention in the acquisition of pragmatic competence (PC). The scarcity of opportunities for exposure to TL in the Foreign Language (FL) context can make the learners’ demonstration of the TL functional abilities more unachievable, where learners do not interact daily with NSs of the target culture with very few chances to practise and thus they become less sensitive to appropriateness placing more importance on grammatical accuracy instead (Hassall 2008; Niezgoda & Roever, 2001; and Bardovi-Harlig & Dörnyei, 1998). In other words, the EFL contexts tend to be less conducive to developing PC, with reduced TL input where teachers and learners share the same first language (L1) as well as the same cultural background, with a limited range of social interactions, shorter and less complex discourse organisations, typical routine, and fewer politeness markers. This is a particular problem for Egypt, given the current context. Therefore, the lack of adequate pragmatic instruction to L2, as is the case in Egypt, particularly in the case in some of the renowned academic and educational intuitions can cause grave problems and consequential repercussions (see previous discussion). A case in point is one of the prominent private higher education institution
in Cairo in Egypt, where the researcher teaches. In fact, the language learning materials involve a paucity of pragmatic information, and the instruction hardly sensitises the learners to the social aspect of the language. Kasper and Rose (2002) claim that not all foreign language classrooms are poor sources of pragmatic information. They contend learners become more sensitive to pragmatics; learners learning in the TL culture are disposed to value pragmatics because of “the amount and quality of relevant input and the opportunities for relevant practice tend to be greater than in a classroom” (Kasper & Rose, 2002, cited in Hassall, 2008:74). Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (1996) and Rose (1997) suggest that if learners are encouraged to think about culturally appropriate ways to use the language in communication then these learners will become aware of their own abilities for pragmatic analyses.

There have been encouraging reports that instructional intervention results in “acquisitional gains” in various areas (Bardovi-Harlig, 2013, 2016; Bardovi-Harlig & Griffin, 2005). This research emphasises the need for teaching the appropriate pragmatic instruction in different contexts, such as in formulating requests. Alcón-Soler (2005) claims that it is essential to determine how to raise the learners' awareness of L2 pragmatic structures in order to help them with their PC. It is essential to equip students with linguistic tools that would enable them to realise, and comprehend and in a contextually appropriate manner. Rueda (2006) believes that the role of instruction may be to furnish the learners with knowledge of the socio-cultural rules of the TL, as well as securing them the chance to decide whether they would like to converge with the NSs’ norms. Achiba (2003) reports the scarcity of studies on the development of pragmatics.
Thus, further research is required to explore how to provide these learners with enough opportunities to benefit from effective input.

Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei (1998), Kasper (2001), Rose and Ng (2001), Kasper and Rose (2002), among others have documented that L2 learners who do not receive instruction in pragmatics may differ considerably from the NSs in their PC in the TL. Unlike grammatical incompetence and errors, which NSs may have tolerance to, pragmatic inappropriateness may adversely influence on the NNSs’ communication with the NSs (Thomas, 1983). According to Kasper and Schmidt (1996) mere exposure to the TL is insufficient for L2 pragmatic development and thus raising the learner’s awareness of form-function mappings and the contextual variables, which may not be salient enough to be noticed are indispensable. Schmidt’s hypothesis (1993,1995, 2001) argues that in order for acquisition to take place, L2 learners need to ‘notice’ and ‘understand’ the available input, and operate on two levels of ‘awareness’. According to Schmidt (1993: 26), noticing (researcher’s enhancement) refers to “registering the simple occurrences of some event”, which he claims to be the underpinning for all learning to take place; whereas understanding involves the “recognition of a general principle, rule, or pattern”. Formal pragmatic instruction is even more acute in the foreign language context; it serves as the only regular source of L2 knowledge with the impoverished prospects for input and interaction outside the classroom (for further discussion on Schmidt’s hypothesis see Literature Review).

Despite the growing interest in L2 pragmatics, little in-depth research has been conducted on the effect of pragmatic instruction on Egyptian EFL learners, where most
of foreign language teaching lacks adequate pragmatics teaching. This study attempts to address this problem by exploring the role of pragmatics instruction in language learning in Egypt as an EFL context and how instruction may affect the development of pragmatic competence, as well as exploring the learners’ attitudes towards this intervention. A lot of the available English language materials in Egypt assume that language learners know when and how it is appropriate to use a specific linguistic item and that they do not provide authentic and pragmatically appropriate models for EFL learners. In particular, language use in some textbooks does not seem to present a good source of speaker-hearer interactions (Barron, 2016). To illustrate, Bardovi-Harlig et al. (1991) reported evidence that only twelve textbooks out of the twenty which they surveyed introduced complete closings. Vellenga (2004) asserts the dearth of pragmatic information in EFL textbooks in terms of amount and quality, after inspecting eight ELT textbooks for cultural information, appropriateness, politeness, speech acts, and register. Holding the same view towards English for Academic Purposes textbooks, Crandall and Basturkem (2004) claim that foreign language teaching/learning textbooks are deficit in pragmatic knowledge. This corresponds with Kakiuchi (2005) who found similar results on investigating 7th grade English textbooks which were approved by the Japanese Ministry of Education on greetings samples. Barron (2016: 2172) attests that the majority of textbooks consider “commonly employed request strategies and cognitively simple forms of modification”; yet, “many strategies are not dealt with and that modification is only touched on.” Therefore, there is no evidence that classroom teachers integrate teaching pragmatics into their English language instruction. In addition to the scarcity of opportunities for exposure to TL in the EFL contexts as well as
lack of opportunities to practise the TL made achieving the functional abilities of the language even more intricate. Thus, the need for instructional intervention is more critical for foreign language learners who are not exposed to adequate input from NSs and hence are not given the chance to acquire pragmatic aspects of the language (Edwards & Csizer, 2004; Tanaka, 1997).

Kasper and Rose (2001) call for further research into the different aspects of learning or teaching in L2 classroom. They argue the effects of instruction on ILP development claiming that classroom research has only played a minimal role in ILP so far. In the same vein, Kasper (1999) calls for classroom research on pragmatics that garners process and opens new realms of learning. Responding to these calls among others, this study explores the role of instruction in pragmatics on the speech act comprehension, production and the voice of Egyptian EFL students.

In the light of this problem, and the results of the previously related studies, this study aims to explore the following research questions:

1.5. The general research questions and sub-questions:

Research question 1

1. To what extent will instruction in pragmatics affect the learners’ ability to make judgments about the appropriateness of requests?

Research question 2

a) To what extent will instruction in pragmatics affect the learners’ performance of target-like requests that are pragmalinguistically appropriate (Leech, 1983)?
b) To what extent will the instruction in pragmatics affect the learners' performance of target-like production of requests that are sociopragmatically appropriate (Thomas, 1983)?

**Research question 3**

3. What are the learners' attitudes towards the TL experience after the pragmatic instructional intervention?

**1.6. Significance of the Study:**
This study can contribute to the burgeoning body of research on developmental pragmatics, especially instructed ILP, by providing detailed description not only of the research study, but also complete picture of the instructional treatment, particulars of the institutional setting (a private higher education institution in Egypt), and descriptive statistical information including sample sizes, quantitative data, qualitative data and their analyses. The distinctiveness of this study is based on its exploration of student voice and attitude along with the learners’ perception and production in an undertaking that has not been explored in Egypt as a context as well as the Middle East (to my best knowledge). An additional contribution that this study has made is exploring Egypt as a context along with participants whose L1 background is Arabic, an area that is understudied in research.

**1.7. Purpose of the study:**
This study examines the role of pragmatics instruction in English as a foreign language and the imperative need for teaching pragmatic aspects. It attempts to investigate the requestive behaviour of Egyptian EFL learners with intermediate English proficiency,
level B1-B2 in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) (Council of Europe, 2011). In instructed situations, investigating L2 learners’ ability to comprehend and use language appropriately is considered the main focus of the study of pragmatics (Bardovi-Harlig, 1996, 2009; Bardovi-Harlig et al., 1991).

1.8. Scope of the Study:
Anchored on Kasper and Blum-Kulka’s (1993) perspective of pragmatics, this study is an applied research study that views pragmatics as the study of people’s comprehension and production of linguistic action in context. It aims at exploring the Egyptian EFL learners’ voice and acquisition: comprehension and production of contextually appropriate language, which would be critically examined against TL norms and NSs’ communication. It is an interventionist study, exploratory in design, which accrues to the research to date on ILP by examining Egyptian EFL learners’ comprehension and realisation of requestive speech acts compared to that of English NSs. It also attempts to shed some light on the learners’ attitude and voice towards pragmatic development of English. For the purpose of the scope of interest of this study, studies that examine adult NNSs’ speech act behaviour and knowledge of requests are the ones that would be included in ILP, with the exception of child first language ILP. Other TL pragmatic features such as discourse markers and particles, speech routines, hedging devices, speech style, and interactional competence are not in the scope of the study. Underpinned in acquisitional research in pragmatics, this study aims at examining the role of instruction in pragmatics on adult NNSs’ pragmatic competence, by exploring their acquisition on three different levels of cognition: their perception, their production, and finally probing into their attitude towards their learning.
1.9. Organisation of the Study:
This introductory chapter has portrayed the setting to the study. It has also provided description of the background including applied linguistics, L2 teaching approaches, Communicative Competence and the inception of pragmatic competence. Interlanguage pragmatics and pragmatics have been examined as well. The main aim and the rationale for the study have also been discussed. Finally, definitions of terms have been presented.

The next chapter will review the literature pertaining to pragmatic theories including speech act theory and politeness theory. Then it will move to discuss the theoretical framework of pragmatics and SLA. It will start by exploring Schmidt’s Noticing Hypothesis (1993, 1995, 2001) then it will move on to examine Sharwood Smith’s Input Enhancement (1991, 1993) and Gardner’s Attitude and Motivation Model (1985). Next will be a discussion of CC and pragmatics instruction. The main models of pragmatic instruction will be explored in the following section. Next, research in pragmatics will be examined in terms of cross-cultural and developmental research.

The third chapter will consider the research methodology adopted in the current study. Firstly, it explains the research paradigm including the research design, as well as the research questions to be addressed. It then discusses the methodological considerations and the design of the study. Other points, like sampling and data collection procedures, are considered. The context of the study the intervention with the materials administered, the procedures for the intervention and analysis are discussed. Data analysis procedures will then be discussed, including quantitative and qualitative methods of analysis. Finally, issues of access and ethics will be explained in detail.
The next three chapters, Chapter 4, Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 will provide findings resulting from the process of analysis and interpretation. The fourth chapter will focus on the first set of data (pre-and post-intervention MDCT) using statistical and quantitative approaches. The fifth chapter will discuss the second set of data (pre-and post-intervention WDCT) using qualitative approaches. The different themes which evolve from the data will be explored in relation to Blum-Kula et al.’s (1989) modified framework of analysis. The sixth chapter will study the themes which arise from the introspective diaries using qualitative approaches, grounded theory (Silverman, 2016; Charmaz, 2014; Glaser and Strauss, 2009).

The final chapter will present the conclusion of the study. It will also involve the study contributions, implications for practitioners, limitations, and recommendations for future research.

1.10. Conclusion:
This opening chapter has described the background to the study with description of applied linguistics, L2 teaching approaches, communicative competence and the inception of pragmatic competence, along with Interlanguage pragmatics and pragmatics. It has also discussed the main aim and the rationale for the study. Finally, definitions have been presented. The next chapter will review the literature including pragmatic and SLA theories, research in pragmatics and the main models of pragmatic instruction.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0. Introduction:
In order to compile the literature review for the present study, the researcher used three principal databases: Summon Cardiff Met University database, the American University in Cairo database, and Google Scholar. The search terms used were: ‘instruction in pragmatics’; ‘teaching pragmatics’; ‘pragmatic competence’; ‘second language acquisition’; ‘foreign language context’; ‘pragmatics and instruction’; ‘interlanguage pragmatics’; ‘requests’; and ‘attitude towards instruction in pragmatics’. Sources were chosen based on four criteria, their appropriateness, relevance, recency, and whether they contain reference material written by authorities in researching the fields of SLA, pragmatics, and instruction in pragmatics.

The literature review is broken down into three sections. The first section offers a brief introduction to this chapter. The second section provides theoretical overview of pragmatics, its significance in SLA, the theoretical frameworks related to teaching pragmatics, the underpinnings of teaching pragmatic competence, as well as a review of the principal pedagogical techniques, while reviewing the importance of instruction in pragmatics. A survey of the current views on ‘speech act theory’ and ‘politeness theory’ will be offered with special focus on request and its strategies as a speech act in which politeness particularly negative politeness is underlined. Finally, the third section introduces a review of the literature on pragmatics and ILP research, an overview of ILP developmental studies that explore L2 learners’ perception and production of requests as well as the learners’ attitude towards TL experience. This chapter offers a review of
the literature of request research in EFL contexts, with little attention to ESL context. The review would have restricted itself to requests and interventional studies only. However, there are very few cross-cultural and longitudinal studies that examine L2 learners’ pragmatic development; they will be reviewed briefly because they relate closely to our discussion. In this final section, some influential studies on the learners’ attitudes towards instruction in pragmatics will be reviewed.

2.1. Pragmatics Theories:

2.1.1. Speech Act Theory: Request as a Speech Act:
Directing the scientific endeavours towards the functional aspect of the language in human communication, in 1962-1965, a theory was initially advocated by Austin, the father of pragmatics, which later was developed by his disciple Searle, making interesting development in this field in 1969-1975. In his theory, Austin (1962) considers speakers as tending to perform certain functions with the language utterance rather than merely using language to say things; accordingly, an utterance can be regarded as a speech act. He argues the minimal unit of human communication, i.e. the speech act, embodies the performance of certain kind of acts rather than a linguistic expression. He proposes a three-fold system to describe a speech act in which he breaks it down to three components, namely: the locution, the illocution and the perlocution. According to his proposed system, the locution refers to the actual words the speaker uses, whereas the illocution expresses the intention, or force behind the utterance such as giving an order, making a request or a promise, apologising, complaining, etc. The last aspect, the perlocution, is the sequel, the interlocutors’ reaction whether verbally or nonverbally.
According to Austin, words do more than make a statement about facts, “to say” something corresponds with, “to do” something (Austin, 1962: 12).

With the notion of achieving intended communicative goals at the heart of the definition of Speech Act Theory, Huang (2010: 682), concurs with Austin, claiming that people use the language not only to express a thought, but also to accomplish their communicative goals. Olshtain and Cohen, A. (1991: 155) further note that every language develops “a set of patterned, routinized utterances that speakers use regularly to perform a variety of functions by which the speaker carries out an act with respect to the hearer (cited in Mahani, 2012: 31). Lenchuk and Ahmed (2013) further state that the interpretation of a speech act depends on the context, including the immediate physical world of the interlocutors, as well as the social, cultural, and historical knowledge they possess. Owing to this, awareness and appreciation of the NSs’ pragmatic behaviour, their system of cultural beliefs, values, and norms is at the heart of L2 language learning.

Subsequent to Austin’s previously mentioned classification system of speech act, Searle (1976:10) contributes widely to the development of the same theory with more refinement and insights into categorising speech acts according to the viewpoint of intentionality. He proposes a five-fold division based on the functions assigned to them, namely, representatives, directives, commissives, expressives and declarations. He explains (1976:10) *representatives* refer to stating what the speakers believe to be true, for instance: to assert, to boast or to deduce. He adds *directives* refer to speakers’ attempts to get the hearers to do something for the speakers’ benefit, for instance: to request, to order, or to beg. Further, he defines *commissives* as the speakers
committing themselves to some future course of action or intends, for instance: to promise, to pledge, or to threaten. He illustrates expressives as the speakers’ expressing their own psychological statements of pleasure or dislike, sorrow, for instance: to thank or to apologise. Finally, declarations are defined as the speakers’ bringing about correspondence between propositional content and the reality, declaring it makes it happen, for example: to baptise or to appoint.

With further refinement, Searle (1979) and Leech (1983) classify speech acts according to the extent of directness, in which direct speech acts derive their illocutionary force from the surface meaning of the utterance, whereas indirect speech acts derive their illocutionary force via inferring the speaker’s true intention in the light of certain conventional ways of formulating them. Direct speech acts tend to exploit a conventional relationship between utterances and functions, whereas indirect speech acts make use of the ambiguity of implicit meaning and connotations. According to Searle, (1975: 60-61) an indirect speech act:

…communicates to the hearer more than he actually says by way of relying on their mutually shared background information, both linguistic and non-linguistic, together with the general powers of rationality and inference on the part of the hearer.

Studying requests makes directives as a general category of speech acts fall within the scope of interest of this study. Besides, it is unequivocal that the study of requests calls attention to the issue of politeness, where the speaker is deemed imposing his/her will on the hearer, and thus requests are considered Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) according to Brown and Levinson (1987: 65). Directives tend to involve different levels of opacity to communicate politeness and to maintain the hearer’s face.
Request as a Speech Act:

Request is one of many speech acts that are used quite frequently in everyday human interactions. Falling under directives together with order, command, appeal, and entreaty besides being an FTA, a request represents an effort on the part of the speaker to get the hearer to do something, generally for a speaker’s goal and best interest which does not seem that this hearer is expected do it according to his/her default course of action or at the hearer's own accord (Jalilifar, 2009). It is beneficial to the speaker but usually costly to the hearer, since imposition is placed on the hearer to meet the speaker’s needs. Wierzbicka (1990, 2003, 2010) emphasises that the speaker has no authority over the hearer to ask for the required act and the hearer is under no obligation to perform the requested act. Hence, request threatens the negative face since it implies that the hearer's freedom will be constrained in some respects. Therefore, the notion of politeness comes into play where the speaker’s needs to attempt to minimise the cost put on the hearer by reducing the level of imposition to save the hearer’s negative face at one level and to get him/her to comply with the request, achieve the communicative goal at another (Ogiermann, 2009; Locastro, 1997). This can be achieved by a variety of means including the verbal resources (modification devices) with which one can manipulate the level of imposition incurred as a means of maintaining indirectness and in turn achieve politeness.

Making a request is very situation-dependent, Abdul Sattar et al. (2009) apprise that on performing a request effectively, speakers should critically consider aspects such as the hearer, the pertinent relationship, the topic, the purpose, and the appropriate linguistic forms to realise the speech act. Similarly, the degree of imposition associated
with the FTA, the relative power of the hearer, and the social distance between the interlocutors are three social variables that need to be considered on assessing weightiness. Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984: 206) explain that requests “call for considerable cultural and linguistic expertise on the part of the learner” and that they “require a high level of appropriateness for their successful completion”. Therefore, it can be clearly stated that it is necessary that language learners should acquire the **sociocultural norms of the TL community** in order to avoid communication breakdown. Further it has been stressed that efforts should be made by the speakers to “minimise the imposition involved in the act itself”, utilising some mitigators and indirect strategies to soften this imposition force, part of the linguistic expertise (cited in Jalilifar, 2009: 65). Blum-Kulka et al. (1989: 18) define mitigators as pragmalinguistic items that soften the impositional force of a request by means of lexical and phrasal modification which can be either internal to the head act of the request or external to it.

**2.1.2. Politeness Theory:**
Wei Ren (2012) argues that among all of the perspectives of politeness, one of the most influential theoretical foundation for the examination of the politeness in the arenas of ILP and cross-cultural pragmatics (linguistic politeness) was proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987), offering a framework in which **the notion of face** is associated to politeness. As mentioned earlier and according to Brown and Levinson (1987) as well as Searle (1969, 1975, 1979), the level of politeness hinges on the speaker’s degree of directness and transparency. Sukamto (2012: 2) states that Brown and Levinson (1987) propose two-fold face wants (desires): negative face and positive face, and thus suggesting two different kinds of politeness: positive politeness and negative politeness.
They define the negative face as “the freedom of action and freedom from imposition”, whereas the positive face as “the expression of involvement or belonging in a group, which includes the desire to be liked and approved of.” Brown and Levinson also propose the relationship between social variables including power (P), distance (D) and size of imposition (SI) and the degree of politeness, the relative politeness between the speaker and the interlocutor.

According to Brown and Levinson, when focus shifts away from the interlocutors’ status differences, solidarity, shared attitudes and values are emphasised and this is where positive politeness is at play. By contrast, negative politeness encourages people to avoid intruding or interrupting each other; in fact, social distance between the speakers is emphasised in which maintaining others’ face is crucial to performing politeness, and accordingly power and distance have to be carefully considered before a speaker chooses a strategy to realise a request. Showing awareness of each other’s face and cooperating to maintain it is at the heart of social interactions in which people should avoid face-saving defensive techniques, minimise cost and maximise benefit which are integral to politeness used in “face-threatening acts” FTAs. They emphasise that when confronted with the need to perform a FTA, one must make a decision concerning how to perform the FTA. It is either one performs it in the most direct manner or that he/she attempts to mitigate FTA effect on the hearer’s face (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 76). The decision of the strategy employed is driven by the assumed seriousness of the FTA, which is governed by the social situation as evaluated by the speaker. Brown and Levinson (1978: 143) assert “the more effort a speaker expends in face-preserving
work, the more he will be seen as trying to satisfy the hearer’s face wants”. Therefore, the more indirect an utterance is, the politer it is assumed to be.

With reference to the intention and the force behind the words, the illocutionary force of an utterance, Schauer (2009: 8) states that Searle (1975, 1976) argues that indicating politeness involves less transparent expressions and verbs. For instance, it is less polite to utter I request you to+ verb as in, ‘I request you to pass me the salt’; instead utterances as ‘Can you pass me the salt?’ are politer. He terms the speech acts using these tentativeness and indirectness characteristics of the authentic language as indirect speech acts. Zufferey (2015: 7) reiterates an indirect request formed as a question opens possibilities for the interlocutor to comply without seeming to obey to an order, or that he or she is able to discard it without damaging the face of the hearer who is ready to take and accept whatever response.

Tan and Farashaiyan (2012:43), motivated by Brown and Levinson's (1987: 65) politeness theory reiterates the practical aspect; claiming requests are FTAs in which there is a risk that a speaker will threaten the hearer’s face. In direct requests, the illocutionary force of the utterance is communicated via grammatical, lexical, or semantic means (for example, “Leave me alone.”). Conventionally indirect statements express the illocution through fixed linguistic behaviour recognised and conventionalised in the TL speech community (for example, “How about cleaning up?”). Non-conventionally indirect requests are realised when the addressee computes the illocutionary force from the interaction of the locution within its context parameters (for
example, “The game is boring”, or “we have been playing this game for an hour now”), where there is partial or no reference to the elements of the request (Jalilifar, 2009: 47). Olshtain and Blum-Kulka (1985) apprise requests usually involve reference to the requestor, the requestee, and the action requested, indication to the speaker is likely to soften the imposition. They add there are different perspectives of request which include array of orientations: hearer-orientation, speaker-orientation, a mix of speaker and hearer orientations or impersonal-orientation. Different cultures around the world have different notions and expectations about how speech acts should be expressed in the L2, although the concept of politeness is universal. Woodfield (2008) and Bardovi-Harlig (2010) among others argue the study of speech as a cultural phenomenon, claiming that it plays a vital role in shaping cultural identity. They contend that different communities vary in their production and interpretation of linguistic conventions and behaviours. Intercultural miscommunication or communication breakdown may occur due to the cultural differences between a speaker and his/her interlocutor(s).

2.2. Pragmatics and SLA:
Research in the area of pragmatics has shown that ‘language in use’ is highly context-dependent in which the forms and uses have to be explained in the realms of pragmatics, beyond the sentential level. The concept of the universality of pragmatics norms across all languages is therefore under examination, in which the occidental norms alongside other norms are identified.

In 1990s, two influential cognitive psychological models addressed acquisition in ILP: The first model is that of Schmidt’s (1993, 1995, 2001), the Noticing Hypothesis, and the
other is that of Bialystok (1991, 1993), which is closely related to children’s acquisition of pragmatic conventions in their native language (L1). The current study is deeply-seated in the former model, a cognitive information-processing approach which advocates the impact of cognitive psychology on SLA. It mainly studies NNSs and adult learners, such as Schmidt’s (1983) well-known report on Wes, a Japanese adult learner of English. Consequently, Bialystok’s (1978) model is not considered in this study because children’s acquisition and first language acquisition are out of its scope.

2.2.1. Theoretical Frameworks of Pragmatics and SLA:

2.2.1.1. Schmidt’s Noticing Hypothesis:
The role of conscious and unconscious processes in foreign or second language (L2) learning has attracted a lot of controversy in applied linguistics for some time. Schmidt (1990) proposes a concept in SLA, the Noticing Hypothesis, in which learners cannot learn any TL feature unless they notice it. The Noticing Hypothesis as established by Schmidt (1995: 20) states that “what learners notice in input is what becomes intake for learning” and available for further mental processing. Schmidt (1995) claims that awareness is required for all learning. He emphasises (2001:26) “while there is subliminal perception, there is no subliminal learning”. He (2001: 3– 4) stresses, “SLA is largely driven by what learners pay attention to and notice in TL input and what they understand the significance of noticed input to be.” In fact, he is concerned with the importance of the role of input in the development of pragmatic competence. As mentioned in Kasper (2000:14), Schmidt refers to ‘Noticing’ as the ‘conscious registration of the occurrence of some event’. He further offers an extension to this concept which is the notion of ‘noticing the gap’, in which he states that L2 learners need to make comparisons between their own IL, output, and the TL input as a model in
order to overcome errors. To further strengthen his argument, he denotes that they need to notice the mismatch between their own production and the target forms as a 'necessary' and 'sufficient' condition for L2 acquisition and learning. To him, (2001: 30) “global alertness to target language input is not sufficient; attention has to be allocated to specific learning objects”. Extending his hypothesis in pragmatics, he observes that (2001: 30) “in order to acquire pragmatics, one must attend to both the linguistic forms of utterances and the relevant social and contextual features with which they are associated.” According to this framework, which is in line with Ishihara and Cohen, A.'s (2014), awareness and attention are inseparable, which manages access to consciousness and thus controls action and learning. A large and burgeoning body of research by Schmidt and Forta (1986); Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991); Kasper (2000, 2001); Rose and Ng (2001); Kasper and Rose (2002); Takahashi (2005, 2010a); Narita (2012); and Mahani (2012) among many other scholars adopt Schmidt’s Noticing Hypothesis (1993, 1995, 2001) about how input becomes intake.

Embracing differing theoretical beliefs, debates continue about this hypothesis in the general field of cognitive psychology. However, some researchers claim that this view has earned its wide support on the basis of assumptions and instincts rather than on validated findings of exhaustive experimental research. John Truscott (1998), Wen Zhisheng (2008) along with other scholars contend the case that noticing is vital for L2 learning remains unresolved and that it is a source of considerable confusion, accordingly; they called for further empirical studies and research efforts in this respect. In contrast, other researchers such as Carr and Curran (1994) as well as Tomlin and
Villa (1994) argue for dividing awareness and learning altogether, claiming their relationship to be notoriously elusive.

Noticing (also known as ‘conscious awareness’ according to Truscott, 1998: 103) alone does not mean that learners inevitably acquire language; rather, the hypothesis states that noticing is the necessary departing point for attainment, whether this noticing is achieved consciously or subconsciously. Schmidt (1993, 1995, 2001) and Leow (2000) argue that noticing is vital to the launch of the cognitive processes, which leads to L2 acquisition and learning. Gass (1988), Skehan (1998), Schmidt (2001) as well as other academics emphasise that L2 learners begin to process input when they “notice” a specific linguistic feature in the input. Schmidt (1990: 132) defines noticing operationally as “cognitive operation that takes place both during and immediately after exposure to the input that is available for self-report.” With only a limited bulk of empirical research undertaken in relation to the role of noticing in L2 acquisition and no clear interpretations, some researchers defy the foundations of the Noticing Hypothesis in cognitive psychology including Truscott (1998: 120) who challenges this strong view of the hypothesis. He prefers its weaker version that noticing is helpful but might not be necessary or vital for learning and acquisition. Assuming its vulnerability and calling for appropriate and exhaustive investigation with empirical research to validate or challenge the Noticing Hypothesis rather than a random mix of ideas and concepts, Truscott (1998: 124) suggests an alternative view or a reformulation of the hypothesis that narrowed down the strong version of the hypothesis. He advocates that noticing is merely tied to the acquisition of metalinguistic knowledge but not to the development of CC. He recognises a role for teachers and teaching materials with regard to noticing,
although he dissociates noticing from competence. Moreover, Terrell (1991) and Van Patten (1993), along with other researchers including Taguchi (2005), have also contended that metalinguistic knowledge can lead to developed comprehension, which will then assist in the improvement of competence. Thus, it can be easily claimed that noticing is an essential element in the development of competence.

In the same vein, Carr and Curran (1994: 214) point out that attention and noticing are more or less synonymous, where one cannot distinguish between paying attention to something and noticing it (Leow, 2001). In 1995, Schmidt notes that although not all learning is intentional, yet all learning requires attention, ‘essential for L2 learning’, with which learners bring order to the input they encounter, facilitating understanding and boosting natural acquisition processes as learners struggle with their language learning (Schmidt, 1995: 4). He further recognises that attention is crucial to learning by which knowledge has mental representations, whether it is gained incidentally or intentionally (Schmidt, 1995:8). This claim is supported via both psychology as well as cognitive science in terms of memory retention, automaticity of retrieval and use; in fact, it is stated “attention is a necessary and sufficient condition for (encoding in) long-term memory to occur”. A number of researchers and theorists including Scovel (1991), Car and Curran (1994), Tomlin and Villa (1994), as well Van Lier (1994) argue the need of attention to input which has been found “necessary for input to become intake that is available for further mental processing” (Schmidt, 1995: 9). In keeping with the same views, McLaughlin (1990) highlights that the literature in experimental psychology indicates that long-term learning of new materials cannot be achieved without
awareness as an essential, but not sole, condition. However, according to Truscott, it can be disputed that proponents of the Noticing Hypothesis fail to provide conclusive findings from experimental research in attention to indicate that language acquisition requires what is more than global awareness of input, arguing that the Noticing Hypothesis is “too vague to offer any principled means of determining what learners must notice” (Truscott, 1998: 110). He (1998: 108) adds that advocates of the Noticing Hypothesis fail to show that learning requires conscious attention to the particular details or information to be learnt, rather than attending to the task or the situation that is the source embodying those details or information (Truscott, 1998:108). Yet, both Long (1983, 1990) and Ellis (1990), through reconsidering a significant quantity of such empirical studies, have concluded that overall conscious learning seems to contribute to successful L2 development.

Although these assertions offer useful insights into L2 acquisition, it is only through substantiated empirical research and evidence that they are validated. Schmidt and Frota (1986) offer the earliest data in which Schmidt analysed his own acquisition of Portuguese during a five-month stay in Brazil. Schmidt cites this as “strong evidence for a close connection between noticing and emergence in production” (1990: 141). Offering compelling evidence to support Schmidt’s case, Kasper (2000: 18) mentions DuFon’s (1999) study on the acquisition of politeness in L2 Indonesian during a homestay programme using six participants. DuFon (1999) claims pragmatic saliency plays a vital role in her learners’ acquisition according to their journals. Her learners make considerable comments on address terms and greeting expressions along with
the sociolinguistic conventions that govern the Indonesian system of address term, which the learners seem to have internalised to some extent by the end of the study. Correspondingly, there can be a case for refuting Truscott’s (1998:117) serious challenges from his own statement “the evidence I dealt with was specifically about grammar instruction, not about formal instruction in general.” So it appears that his contentions do not extend to challenge the application of the Noticing Hypothesis in other areas. His challenge seems to be strictly applicable to grammar. Therefore, bringing the hypothesis into effect in areas such as pragmatics seems viable. However, further investigation should be prompted to offer further evidence that supports or refutes Truscott’s proposed weaker version of the Noticing Hypothesis. It should explore the relationship between the learners’ training and their acquisition of metalinguistic knowledge, facilitating their cognisance of how these processes contribute to their CC, which may assist to clarify what role noticing plays in L2 learning providing valuable information. This study aims at lending some supportive evidence to challenge Truscott’s weak version of the Noticing Hypothesis, by exploring the role of noticing and pragmatics instruction in promoting L2 language learning and development, in which noticing is surmised as necessary and vital but not sufficient for language learning (Schmidt, 1991: 141).

2.2.1.2. Input Enhancement:
Given the centrality of noticing to the process of acquisition in directing the learners’ attention to language forms and features, Sharwood Smith’s (1991: 121, 1993) Input Enhancement has been under investigation as an approach that is consistent with noticing in raising the learners’ awareness (Norouzian & Eslami, 2016; Dastjerdi &
Farshid, 2011). According to Sharwood-Smith (1991: 119), it is “the process by which language input becomes salient to the learner”, to direct the learners to how the language system works. Polio (2007) defines input enhancement as a process in which teachers, materials designers and developers visually enhance materials; for instance, they use colouring, boldfacing, italicising, underlining, capitalising to highlight certain aspects and features. Leow (2007: 38) offers a broader definition in which she refers to it as “any effort to draw learners’ attention to certain language features” whether this selective attention on the learners’ part should be handled reactively (Doughty & Williams, 1998) or proactively (Ellis, 2001). Input enhancement together with input flood, consciousness raising tasks (Sharwood Smith, 1981), implicit feedback (recasts) are considered some of the techniques employed by implicit methods of teaching according to Kasper (2001). Schmidt (2001) attests input enhancement is about bringing the TL features to the focal attention of L2 learners (see studies Sykes, 2009; Li, 2012; Sykes, 2013; Fukuya & Zhang, 2002; Leow, 2000), where certain language features are attended to, and thus they become ready for internalisation from the input.

2.2.1.3. Attitude/Motivation in Language Learning:
It has been widely reported that attitudes play a vital role in the learners’ adoption of L2 standards for linguistic action (Locastro, 2001: 70). Gardner and Lambert (1972) point out that language learning behaviour is largely influenced by the learner’s attitude towards the TL and the TL community as well as the culture. Masgoret and Gardner (2003: 172) argue “individuals who expressed an interest in learning the language in order to interact, meet, socialise, become friends with members of the other community would be more open than individuals who did not express such reasons.” More
particularly, Kasper and Schmidt (1996) claim the learners’ disposition to adopt L2 pragmatic norms is likely to be sensitive to their attitudes towards the TL and its community. Furthermore, it has been contended that these learners are likely to accept the reconstruction of their self and allow for the emergence of their new identity in the light of the TL norms and practices (reconciliation between identities).

**Definition of Attitudes:**

Attitude, according to Smith (1971), is an assortment of beliefs about an object or a situation, which predisposes one to react in a particular manner. Wenden (1985, 1991; cited in Karahan, 2007:75) defines attitudes as encompassing three components: cognitive, evaluative, and behavioural (see Chapter 6). The cognitive component involves beliefs or opinions about the object or situation related to the attitude. Regarding the evaluative component, it involves the feelings or the emotions that are prompted towards the objects or situations of interest, be it like or dislike. And finally, with reference to the behavioural component, certain attitudes provide learners with a disposition to adopt particular learning behaviours, one’s actions or behavioural intentions towards the object. Therefore, it can be argued that attitudes involve not only a set of beliefs and feelings but behaviours as well. Van Els *et al.* (1984: 33) further pinpoint:

> ...it does not really matter whether all or only one of the three components are measured; the relationship between the components is so close that sufficient information on an attitude can be obtained by measuring only one component, no matter which... (Van Els *et al.*, 1984: 33)

More particularly, Bernat (2008: 7) argues that beliefs are thought to have the potential for shaping the learners’ cognitive and affective processes, which may involve either negative or positive attitudes towards the TL. Baker (1988) further describes attitudes to
be dimensional, they vary in degree of favourability or lack of. Ellis (1994: 199) adds that attitudes can be modified by experience; they are malleable to be altered, taught and learnt. Yang (2012) refers to attitude in language learning as the openness to the TL, its culture or to the speakers of the TL.

It is widely recognised that these beliefs, feelings, and behaviours are directly associated with the success in language learning. Achievement in language learning rests not only on the learners’ cognitive capacities (mental and intellectual faculties) but also on their attitudes towards language learning experiences (Gardner, 2007). Accordingly, positive attitudes are deemed necessary to boost the efficiency of language learners and thus it is likely to foster getting a positive result and success in language learning. They seem paramount in facilitating language learning experience (Cohen, A. & Macaro, 2007). The positive attitudes are quintessentially connected to the TL, its community and the culture represented by its speakers. Brown (2007: 193) believes that "positive attitudes toward self, the native language group, and the TL group enhanced proficiency". Noels et al. (2003: 36) claim positive attitudes may make the experience more conducive to language learning because the “learners can be expected to want to be able to communicate with native speakers of the language they are learning.” Positive attitudes towards the TL refer to one’s eagerness to learn the TL and a willingness to expend the required efforts or lack of based on one’s own beliefs. Finally, attitudes are necessary to boost the efficiency of language learners and to foster their getting positive results in their language learning. Therefore, much research is required to explore learners’ attitudes towards TL.
Attitudes Towards the TL:

Masgoret and Gardner define attitudes towards learning the TL as “the affect experienced while learning the language” (2003: 173). As previously mentioned, entertaining favourable attitudes towards the TL is considered significant support to foreign or second language learning, whereas having negative attitudes towards the language impairs its development. The present study embraces this claim, where the TL is meant to include the TL itself, TL community and culture. It can be directly applicable to many participants who tended to exhibit high levels of performance in the WDCT (for further discussion see Chapter 5), when manifesting attributes of positive attitude and unequivocally poor one when their attitude towards the TL has been noted to be negative (for further discussion see Chapter 6). For instance, learners who held negative attitudes tended to embrace negative predisposition to TL experiencing resentment to the TL, unmanageable levels of anxiety, lack of self-confidence, inhibitions, inability to take risks, and other barriers to their TL learning (Horwitz, 2001). It can be detected that learners with positive attitudes are predisposed to have goals and desires, expend the required efforts to achieve them, be persistent and attentive to the task at hand; in short they tend to be well motivated. It is all about the affective state with which the learners approach the TL learning experience (for further discussion see Chapter 6). However, this proposition seems to be set in contrast to Cohen, Y. and Norst’s (1989: 63) views, in which she counter-claims that adopting a positive or negative attitude towards the TL is not a key feature to being motivated and goal-directed to learn the language. She further emphasises that one may be motivated to learn a language in spite of having a negative attitude towards it. Therefore, further
evidence is required to challenge such claims, in which attitude has a decisive role in success in L2 learning.

**Attitudes Towards the Language Learning Experience:**

The individual's beliefs and reaction towards any element that is directly associated with the context in which the TL is taught is referred to as the attitudes towards the language learning experience. This may include the TL itself, the materials taught, the facilitator, and the language learner. Mills *et al.* (2007: 432) explicate “self-belief is language learning self-concept.”

**Motivation in Language Learning: Factors Affecting Learners’ Attitudes:**

Classified as an affective variable on shaping the language learner engagement in learning, Skehan (1998) refers to motivation as a cognitive and emotional process that plays a significant role in fostering language learning and acquisition. Gardner (2007: 10) exemplifies “the motivated individual is goal directed, expends effort, is persistent, is attentive, has desires (wants), exhibits positive affect, is aroused, has expectancies, demonstrates self-confidence [self-efficacy], and has reasons [motives]”. He reiterates that these goals may be classified as: cognitive, affective, or behavioural according to their nature. Gass and Mackey (2012: 399) refer to motivation as an encapsulation of ‘effort, desire, and positive affect towards learning the language’. Gardner and Lambert (1972) identify motivation as a significant cause of variability in language learning and that it has an independent role apart from that of ability and aptitude (cited in Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2013). Together with self-confidence, anxiety levels, and affect including enjoying the activity itself, seems to play a vital role in invoking the learners’ motivation.
according to Schmidt, Boriae, and Kassabgy (1996). Horwitz (1990, cited in Engin, 2009: 1036) defines it as “the feelings of the learner toward the particular target language, its culture and the individual pragmatic reasons for learning a foreign language.” Gardner's (1985: 10) socio-educational model refers to motivation as “the extent to which the individual works or strivies to learn the language because of a desire to do so and the satisfaction experienced in this activity.” Refining this definition by adding a dichotomous perspective, Brown (2000) suggests that motivation should be examined in terms of the extrinsic or the intrinsic motives of the learner. For the purpose of this study, motivation would be limited to Horwitz's and Gardner's definitions, with little detail concerning whether the learners’ goal orientation is instrumental or integrative motivation (Gardner, 1985, 1988, 1991) or even assimilative and resultative. The reason for this constraint is the scope of this study, the foreign language context, in which integrative motivation as an orientation is likely to be absent because of the paucity of opportunities for exposure to the TL community. Hence, their decision would never be well-informed concerning the TL community with little chance for exposure and communication. It is deemed unnecessary to determine whether the learners embraced integrative or instrumental orientations towards learning the TL, as what seems more important is whether the learners are highly oriented towards their goals of learning TL.

A) Instrumental:
Hudson (2001) refers to instrumental motivation as a utilitarian kind of orientation with reference to the reason behind the L2 learning in which the learners seek language learning and acquisition in order to acquire ‘something practical or concrete’. For instance, learners attain an L2 language as a means to receive some external reward or
to pursue a specific goal, e.g. furthering a career, studying abroad, etc. Instrumental motivation prompts the goal of gaining some social or economic reward through L2 achievement, therefore it represents a more functional reason for language learning. According to Locastro (2001); Gardner (2007); Engin (2009) (to name but a few), learners exert effort and study hard to attain higher grades or some sort of academic achievement (with more fine-grained analysis: resultative motivation).

B) Integrative:

Gardner and Lambert (1972: 132) refer to integrative motivation as ‘reflecting a sincere and personal interest in the people and culture represented by the other group’. Crookes and Schmidt (1991) discuss it as the learner’s orientation with reference to the reason behind the L2 learning. It is the willingness to identify, at least partially, with an admired society/culture group. For example, the desire of adding another language and an additional cultural identity to one’s own language and identity is considered an integrative motivation (with more fined-grained analysis: assimilative motivation). It is learning for self-perceived needs, where one adopts behavioural and cognitive features that belong to some other culture. Research on motivation suggests that integrativeness is commonly found to be in concomitant with higher scores on proficiency tests in foreign language (Brown, 2007: 171). Many researchers including Spolsky (1969); Gardner and Lambert (1972); Taylor et al. (1977); Csizer and Dörnyei (2005); and Gardner (2007) report that integrative orientation of motivation sustains long-term success and learning. Brown (2000) advocates a combination of both orientations, whereas others like Gardner et al. (2004, cited in Brown, 2007: 171) find that both orientations have roughly the same influence on the learners of French in Canada, and Lamb (2004, cited in Brown) reports that both constructs are ‘indistinguishable’. This study is intended to restrict itself to exploring a
combination of both orientations rather than each one separately whether learners benefit from instrumental, integrative or a combination of both, or either of them. In fact, the focus will be on the motivational intensity, be it high, low or mild motivational intensity where learners are likely to be aware of the importance of learning a foreign or a second language. Hence, they are likely to embrace a desire to learn the TL garnering either integrative or instrumental motivation or a blend of both (Engin, 2009: 1040). Furthermore, it should be noted that ego-boundaries and fear of assimilation are some of the affective factors that might facilitate or debilitate language learning. They are sometimes impenetrable to instruction and thus they may impede L2 learning.

2.2.2. Communicative Competence and Pragmatic Competence:
For the past few decades, pragmatic competence (PC) has been under investigation and in the focus of a plethora of research across the different languages (for further discussion on CC, see Chapter 1), particularly in the EFL contexts, where this study is situated. Due to the intricacy of the term, PC was defined by a multitude of researchers including Bialystok (1993: 43) who states it.

…encompasses a variety of abilities in the use and interpretation of language in context. These include the speakers’ ability to use language for different purposes, such as greeting, requesting, informing, demanding and so on, the speakers’ ability to adapt or change language according to the needs or expectations of the listener or situation, and the speakers’ ability to follow accepted rules; the maxims, if you will, for conversation and narrative. (Bialystok, 1993: 43)

Taghuci (2008: 34) reiterates it is “the ability to perform language functions in a context”. She (2011: 288) further emphasises that developing one’s PC involves attaining both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic competences as well as efficiently utilising them in real-time communication. Leech (1983:10) refers to the pragmalinguistic competence as the available linguistic resources a language offers for assigning communicative acts
and interpersonal meaning including pragmatic strategies like directness and indirectness, a wide gamut of linguistic forms and routines which can intensify or soften a communicative act. He further defines the sociopragmatic competence as the social perception and the set of rules underlying the language users’ interpretations and performance of communicative acts (Taguchi, 2011). Rose and Kasper (2001: 51) highlight pragmalinguistic competence “requires mapping of form, meaning, force and context, which are sometimes obligatory [as in the case of pre-packaged routines] and sometimes not [as in the case of indirectness]”. Regarding the sociopragmatic competence, they state it hinges on “the sociological interface of pragmatics” (Rose & Kasper, 2001:10). The communicative act according to Kasper and Rose (2002) is an act that does not only include realising speech acts (such as greeting, apologising, complaining, complimenting, & requesting), but it also refers to the engagement in different types of discourse with various length and complexity. To illustrate, Kecskes cites Yorio’s (1980) example (cited in 2013: 421) when the shop assistant addresses a client saying ‘What do you want’ instead of ‘What can I do for you’. The former question could be taken as an inappropriate or even rude at the pragmatic level, whereas the latter question involves a routine formula according to the preferences of the given speech community. This is in spite of the fact that the former question is a grammatically and semantically accurate question.

Eventually, Taguchi (2009) asserts PC has become thus an object of a substantial body research and examination in an array of disciplines including linguistics, applied linguistics, psychology, sociology, SLA and cross-cultural studies such as, Blum-Kulka
et al. (1989); Wierzbicka (1990, 2003, 2010); Spencer-Oatey and Jiang, (2003); Taguchi (2012); and Kecskes (2013) to cite only a few studies among many others.

2.2.2.1. Pragmatics Instruction: Teachability of Pragmatics:
Celce-Murcia’s (2001) view of teaching pragmatic aspects of language has informed a body of research in language learning and communicative language pedagogy, which opposes the model of language learning as merely studying inventories of vocabulary items and grammar rules. Instead, it offers classroom practitioners a very useful model which perceives language learning as the ability to communicate, comprehend, and convey meaning to others. Accordingly, the learners’ ability to communicate effectively has come to be seen as hinging not only on their L2 grammatical competence, but also on their pragmatic competence (Bardovi-Harlig, 2012; Kasper, 2001; Tanaka, 1997). It thus follows that developing PC, an integral component of CC, is an indispensable facet of language ability so that L2 learners comprehend and can be understood in their communication and interactions with NSs. Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) along with other researchers including Rose and Kasper (2001) and Hassall (2003) argue that speech communities differ in their evaluation of the interlocutors’ social distance and power, rights and obligations and the size of imposition involved in a specific communicative act. Therefore, L2 language users and learners have some critical and informed decisions to make and gaining more awareness into PC is growing essential for them to become able to express their communicative needs (Kim, 2016) (see Chapter 1).

Teachability of Pragmatics:
Assuming that pragmatic knowledge simply develops alongside lexical and grammatical knowledge, Gass (1991) claims that PC cannot be taught and that explicit focus on
pragmatics in teaching is not necessary, as learners will gradually absorb it from the available input through their exposure to the TL. Takahashi (2010a), concurring with Jeon and Kaya (2006) as well as Taguchi (2010, 2015), argues that natural exposure alone cannot foster L2 pragmatic development, especially in foreign language settings where learners are introduced to the L2 pragmatic features that are not salient enough for them to notice, besides the scarcity of resources they get exposed to (Khorshidi, 2013; Li, 2012; Rose, 2005). In line with Takahashi (2010a), Taguchi’s (2010, 2015) findings substantiate that exposure alone results in slow developmental pragmalinguistic knowledge (if there is any development). Further, she, together with other researchers including Bouton (1994) and Schmidt (1995, 2001), emphasises the general consensus on the slow pragmatic development in naturalistic context and exposure, even with extended length of stay in the TL community, second language context (Alcón-Soler, 2015). Kasper (1997a: 1) argues that learners should be furnished with opportunities to develop their PC, and although competence cannot be taught, she states:

…competence is a type of knowledge that learners possess, develop, acquire, use or lose. The challenge for foreign or second language teaching is whether we can arrange learning opportunities in such a way that they benefit the development of pragmatic competence in L2. (Kasper, 1997a: 1)

She further stresses the learners’ inability to ‘always make use of their free ride’. In fact, educational psychologists argue that respondents do not always transfer knowledge and strategies at their disposal to new tasks; in other words, learners are frequently found to underuse politeness marking in L2 even though they regularly mark it as available knowledge in their utterances for politeness in L1 (DeKeyser, 2007).
Kasper and Rose (2002); Rose (2005); Takahashi (2010a, 2010b); Taguchi (2015); and Kim (2016) among many other scholars argue that foreign language learners are in dire need of instruction in the TL pragmatics. They argue that these learners are underprivileged with the scarcity of the available pragmatic knowledge, the insufficient opportunities for practice, the fault of which lies with the limited and decontextualized materials they get exposed to (Al Tarawneh, 2015; Crandall and Basturkmen, 2004; Vellenga, 2004; Bardovi-Harlig, 2001). Many scholars including Bardovi-Harlig et al. (1991); Boxer and Pickering (1995); Gilmore (2004); Vellenga (2004); and Nguyen (2011) claim that the dearth of pragmatic features in these materials together with this non-conducive context are unlikely to furnish them with the required pragmalinguistic and the sociolinguistic input to facilitate their learning. Furthermore, Lörscher and Schulze (1988) among many other scholars (such as Ekin, 2013, Delen & Tavil, 2010) claim EFL contexts lack opportunities for practice and that even the available opportunities offer the learners a narrow scope pragmatic features and restricted input, which in turn, offers them paucity of various strategies along with inadequate opportunities to practise the TL. Bardovi-Harlig (2001: 25) concurring with Ekin (2013) stresses that “it is important to recognize, that, in general, coursebooks cannot be counted on as a reliable source of pragmatic input for classroom language learners”.

Many researchers, including Boxer and Pickering (1995: 56) suggest that it is “only through materials that reflect how we really speak, rather than how we think we speak, will language learners receive an accurate account of the rules of speaking in a second or foreign language”. Jeon and Kaya (2006: 169) attest “L2 pragmatics instruction is a
crucial response to scarce opportunities for exposure to target pragmatic norms and an impoverished environment for practice” (see previous discussion, Chapter 1). Furthermore, Bardovi-Harlig (1999); Kasper and Rose (1999); Eslami-Rasekh, Z. et al. (2004); Rose (2005); Ishihara and Cohen, A. (2014) make a strong case that even grammatically advanced learners are likely to use language inappropriately and that they suffer from pragmatic failures missing out pragmatic functions and relevant contextual factors which are often not salient to them and may not be noticed. They have a propensity to exhibit significant gaps in their L2 pragmatics. Bardovi-Harlig (2001: 29), echoed by Ghasempour and Farnia (2016), claims that learners who do not receive specific instruction in L2 pragmatics demonstrate noticeable divergence from NSs in both production and comprehension. Therefore, pedagogical intervention is attested and it becomes compelling to incorporate pragmatic instruction in EFL classrooms where they suffer from a lack of exposure and opportunities for practice.

With accumulating reports of encouraging evidence that instructional intervention results in acquisitional gains, a wide consensus is growing that lend support to the teachability of pragmatics and its instructional gains in various areas and with multiple target pragmatic features and assessment tasks (Taguchi, 2014, 2015; Birjandi & Derakhshan, 2014; Jernigan, 2012; Kasper & Rose, 2002; Rose, 2000, 2005). The consistency of their findings suggests generalizability, thus, the case to adopt PC as a goal in L2 teaching is strengthened and intensified. Taguchi et al. (2015) take it a step further and argue instruction is powerful enough to alter naturalistic patterns of development in students’ abilities with meaningful, stable, and robust learning results.
It is widely argued that most aspects of pragmatics are amenable to instruction and that certain instructional methods are surmised to lead to more robust learning, according to many scholars including Olshtain and Cohen, A. (1990); Jeon and Kaya (2006); Martinez-Flor and Usó-Juan (2010); Takahashi (2010a); Taguchi (2015). Further support for the importance of instruction in pragmatics can be found within cognitive psychology, anchored in Schmidt’s (1993, 1995, 2001) Noticing Hypothesis (see section 2.2.1.1). In keeping with Schmidt’s hypothesis, Sedighi and Nazari (2007: 22) accentuate the importance of the use of consciousness-raising techniques which capitalise on the learners’ attention to linguistic forms to pay informed attention to contextual features of their input, attempting to draw their attention to the formal and functional properties of L2, which is a prerequisite for the development of well-balanced CC. Taguchi (2015: 36) stresses that consciousness-raising pushes learners to deduce rules by comparing and analysing different forms and social factors, furnished with ample opportunity to process input at an extensive level resulting higher awareness of the target pragmatic features.

2.2.2.2. Types of Instructional Methods:
With this wide consensus on the necessity of pragmatic instruction, the effective methods to manage this challenging undertaking are to come next on the pedagogical agenda. It is recognised that objectives of attainment are set at advanced to native-like competency and that methods of instruction have been explored. Two-fold methods are proposed and comparisons are made between the teaching methods: explicit versus implicit conditions of teaching. Kasper (2001) explains explicit instruction involves direct metapragmatic explanation, overt explanation of the target pragmatic features conjoined
with practice tasks; in contrast, implicit method of teaching involves no metapragmatic explanation. In fact, it includes promoting the learners' understanding regarding the TL pragmatic features using input flood, input enhancement techniques, implicit feedback, and consciousness raising. It focuses on the learners' induction and their self-discovery of target pragmatic features from the input (Jeon and Kaya, 2006).

2.3. Research in Pragmatics:

![Figure 1: Strands of Research in Interlanguage Pragmatics](image)

2.3.1. Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and Interlanguage Pragmatics (ILP) Research:

As a branch of SLA research, on the one hand, and as a subset of pragmatics on the other, ILP stands out as a sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic, or simply linguistic enterprise (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993). Alcón-Soler and Martínez-Flor (2008: 25) define ILP as a field that seeks to “describe and explain learners’ use, perception, and acquisition of L2 pragmatic ability both in L2 contexts; in fact, it reflects the growing interest in understanding the social and pragmatic aspects of FL acquisition in general.” Motivated by Hymes’s (1967, 1972) concept of CC (see Chapter 1), ILP uses pragmatic theories,
principles and frameworks to examine how L2 learners encode and decode meaning in their L2 (Eslami & Eslami-Rasekh, 2008). Bardovi-Harlig (2012) claims that the field of pragmatics and the way it is acquired by ESL/EFL learners have undergone a number of changes since 1993, when Kasper and Blum-Kulka issued the first book on ILP. A notable number of scholars including Kasper and Dahl (1991); Kasper (2001); Kasper and Rose (2002) have consequently been narrowing down the definition of ILP. A fine-grained definition of ILP is offered by Kasper and Dahl (1991: 216) in which they claim it to study “non-native speakers' comprehension and production of speech acts as a framework, and how their L2-related speech act knowledge is acquired”. With the learner at the heart of inquiry, Bardovi-Harlig (2013: 69) defines ILP as “the study of language from the point of view of users”, (NNS included, but not limited to L2 learners, L2 users are included as well), “especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication.” In other words, ILP studies hence place special emphasis on L2 learners’ perception and production of speech act realisation to disclose what pragmatic knowledge learners lack in their L2 development and what factors influence their pragmatic behaviour. Adopting this research design makes the current study engrained in ILP research.

Bardovi-Harlig (1999, 2013) and Kasper (1992) emphasise the fact that a substantial body of research on ILP exists, though a great part of it focuses on use (comparative), without much attempt to explore its development and acquisition. This reflects the necessity for further research in this respect, which this research attempts to realise
through exploring the pragmatic development of learners at various levels: perception, production, and its influence on their attitude and voice.

### 2.3.2. Cross-cultural Research in Pragmatics:

In the past few decades, a substantial body of research in the field of cross-cultural pragmatics, contrastive pragmatics, has been rapidly growing. With a large-scale project and a seminal work, Blum-Kulka *et al.* (1989) initiated this field of cross-cultural research while examining cross-cultural, sociopragmatic and IL variation in speech act realisation in a large number of different languages in their cross-cultural speech act realisation project (CCSARP). LoCastro (2012) refers to cross-cultural pragmatic research as the study of contextual language use by language users from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Jalilifar (2009: 47) concurs, stating it emerges to examine pragmatic features including speech acts across a range of languages, to investigate the universality of pragmatic principles in speech act realisation and the characteristics of these universals. Studies of Kasper and Dahl (1991); Nelson *et al.* (2002); Hassall (1999, 2001, 2003); Chen (2007) as well as Economidou-Kogetsidis (2010) are some examples of research in this field. Cenoz (1995: 3), more recently reiterated by Nureddeen (2008) and Woodfield (2008) states “the study of speech as a cultural phenomenon and its role in cultural identity has shown that different communities vary in their production and interpretation of linguistic behaviour”. Consequently, speech act research was primarily motivated to facilitate communication among communities and individuals with an array of socio-cultural backgrounds. It attempts to sketch the pragmatic rules that govern the use of the language in the diverse cultures aiming at shedding light on the socio-cultural attitudes and values of
these cultures. To illustrate, some studies explore the speech act of request in English as for instance Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) and Economidou-Kogetsidis (2010). Others researchers restrict themselves to request realisation in Spanish, such as Le Pair (1996), Ruzickova (2007), or in Japanese, such as Kahraman and Akkus (2007) (to name but a few). Most of the aforementioned studies deal with ILP performance and use, and thus they provide ample information regarding performance, but they say nothing about development, as revealed in longitudinal studies like Barron (2003); Garcia (2004); and Schauer (2004, 2006). Jalilifar (2009: 46) emphasises that cross-cultural studies, noticeably, provide no information concerning the extent to which NNSs will approximate NSs’ norms of speech act, learners’ development.

On a similar note, Schauer (2009: 34) acquiescent with Kasper and Schmidt (1996); Barron and Warga, (2007); and Taguchi (2012); claims “ILP studies in the 1980s and most of the 1990s focus almost exclusively on comparing and contrasting NSs’ and language learners’ production and comprehension of speech acts.” Kasper (1992: 205) stresses that “the bulk of interlanguage pragmatics research derives its research questions and methods from empirical, and specifically cross-cultural, pragmatics” (see Barron, 2003). Cenoz and Valencia (1996: 41) claim these cross-cultural studies of speech acts can foster SLA research by providing researchers with insights on “the strategies used by learners in the production of speech acts” (Bardovi-Harlig, 2010; Jung, 2002). Further, Kasper and Dahl (1991:216) denote that studies that examine speech acts from a linguistic perspective focus both on the perception and production of speech acts in investigational and natural settings (Lin, 2014; Trosborg, 2010; Martínez-
To illustrate, Halupka-Rešetar (2014: 31) emphasises that a number of researchers such as Trosborg (1995); Hill (1997); Rose (2000); Woodfield (2006) (to mention but a few) have examined the production and comprehension of speech acts by L2 learners to find out to what extent their pragmatic competence deviates or approximates to that of NSs using methods and data from empirical, and specifically cross-cultural, pragmatics.

On surveying cross-cultural studies, universal and language specific components in the realisation of speech-acts were detected. The universal pragmatic knowledge is found to be shared across languages as in the basic strategies: direct, conventionally indirect and nonconventional indirect or hints and their equivalents are used in the realisation of request as a speech act (Alcón-Soler & Safont-Jordà, 2007; Cenoz, 2003; Blum-Kulka, 1987, 1994). Conveying pragmatic intent indirectly and making use of routine formulae are two types of pragmatic strategies that are universally available according to Kasper and Schmidt (1996); and Kasper and Rose (2002). However, as it was previously stated, they (NNSs and users) are disposed to avoid transferring such shared knowledge according to Blum-Kulka and Olhstain (1984). As for the language specific component, there are different interactional styles and cross-linguistic differences in the selection, distribution and realisation of speech acts across cultures. For instance, in House and Kasper’s study (1981), German speakers were found to be more direct than British English speakers when uttering requests. In addition, English speakers were detected to have a disposition to use indirect forms of request than speakers of a number of other languages (Fukushima, 1996). Nevertheless, Wierzbicka (1990, 2003,
2010) insist on the disputability of the universality versus culture-specificity issue particularly, when non-western languages and cultures are considered as in Kachru's study (1994).

For the purpose of this study, the universal and language specific components in the realisation of speech acts will be targeted for instruction. It will use raising awareness techniques, where the commonly shared pragmatic knowledge and features will be highlighted and fostered as the learners of the language will be encouraged to utilise and/or transfer them to the TL. Besides, the specific component in the realisation of speech acts will be targeted in the intervention as well, as a gap in the learners’ and the users’ knowledge that needs to be bridged. This should be achieved via enhancing the learners’ awareness to motivate them to notice the incompatibility and deviations of their ILP and the TL.

Blum- Kulka, House and Kasper's (1989) Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realisation Project (CCSARP) signifies one of the most crucial cross-cultural research and theoretical pragmatics, offering a significant model for a study of SLA. It sets out to identify the NSs’ patterns of realisation in relation to requests and apologies with respect to different social constraints in each of the languages studied. It determines the variation in the realisation patterns of both speech acts cross-linguistically, to detect the similarities and differences between NSs and NNSs realisation patterns relative to the same social constraints. DCTs were employed to gather data from both NSs and NNSs. Five request situations were utilised to elicit data in eight different languages, namely British
English, American English, Australian English, Canadian French, German, Russian, Danish, and Hebrew. Reliable comparability was catered for in the design of the study. It can be clearly inferred that the researchers have investigated the strategies and the linguistic means by which particular speech acts were realised and their universality, the contextual factors that determine the speakers' choices from speech act sets, and whether this variation is cross-culturally different as well as the contextual distribution of these realisation patterns. Nevertheless, as this project has had an immense impact on pragmatics in language teaching, this study is included. Based on their empirical data and findings, they report culture-bound features were detected in request realisation in terms of levels of directness in strategy and strategy type distribution (different levels were noted), the use of formulaic expressions, internal and external modifications, and utterance length. They suggest that conventionally indirect strategies tended to be the most commonly used across languages to realise requests, because among the four languages under investigation, conventionally indirect strategies were noted to be the most frequently employed. Variation was maintained in strategy type distribution as well, in which Hebrew natives employed hedged performatives with high frequency more than that used in English by NSs. One, among other issues that were revealed, is that both German and Danish learners of British English diverged from the British norms and followed their L1 norms in the choice of directness of the request in two of the five situations, where these L2 learners resorted to using direct imperatives, while the British used less direct preparatory questions. In addition, with reference to internal and external modifications, analyses of the data suggested that both learners tended to use fewer syntactic downgraders, as in the use of certain modal verbs.
2.3.3. Developmental/Acquisitional Research in Pragmatics:
Bardovi-Harlig (2013: 69) emphasises that compared to the large body of research on NNSs’ use of pragmatic knowledge, little research has examined the acquisition of pragmatic competence by adult NNSs. She even goes to the extent of stating: “all studies of L2 acquisition of pragmatics belong to ILP, however, not all ILP studies are acquisitional”. As previously mentioned, studies of learner PC are primarily descriptive in nature and include little or no discussion of the process through which learners develop TL pragmatics. Kasper (2001:503) reiterates that the body of research in L2 pragmatic development is neither long nor rich, yet there are some, to which Schauer (2009: 34) suggests two types of developmental study are commonly distinguished in ILP: those based on a longitudinal design and those based on a cross-sectional design. Kasper and Schmidt (1996: 150) argue that it has been widely acceptable that developmental studies, whether using longitudinal or cross-section design, investigate the use of speech act realisation strategies by NNSs or learners at different proficiency levels. Furthermore, they (1996) together with Kasper and Rose (1999); Jung, (2002); Nguyen (2013) claim that the results of the majority of these studies support the view that learners have access to the same range of realisation strategies as NSs, irrespective of proficiency level. However, proficiency was found to have some effects on the frequency and contextual distribution of realisation strategies, which is something that does not fall within our scope of interest in this research (Xiao, 2015; Hassall, 1997; Takahashi, 1996; Trosborg, 1995; and Blum-Kulka et al., 1989).
2.3.3.1. Longitudinal Studies:
In contrast to cross-cultural pragmatics, which deals with the comparison of learners' pragmatic performance with that of NSs, research conducted in the area of ILP adopts a SLA perspective by focusing on those developmental issues that affect learner's development of pragmatics (Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015; Kasper & Rose, 2002). Kasper and Rose (2002: 76) highlight that pragmatic development may be sketched in a series of developmental language states based on findings on the learners' differences across the language proficiency levels studied, documenting learners' speech acts realisations as elicited through a variety of research instruments. The focal areas of inspection of longitudinal ILP research according to Kasper and Rose (1999: 90) involve investigations in a full discourse context rather than only speech acts, it examines pragmatic features such as: pragmatic routines, discourse markers, pragmatic fluency, and conversational ability. The settings of data collection embrace second/foreign language classrooms, investigating the effect of instruction on pragmatic learning, as well as outside-classroom studies. Longitudinal research is one strand of methodology that explores change within the L2 pragmatic system over time and the influences on this system.
Ortega and Iberri-Shea (2005) claim the development of adult NNSs' pragmatic competence using longitudinal data has been explored in very limited research. Very few studies are found to employ longitudinal methodology in spite of the significant role it plays by providing rich and reliable insights into the learners' pathways to the L2 evolving capacities using individual micro-level analysis (Schauer, 2006). It is axiomatic that learning L2 takes a long time and observing participants over an extended period of
time, with multi-wave data collection, capturing real trends of change in relationships would allow remarkable interpretations and reliable inferences. Among the few studies that are found are Schmidt (1983); Billmyer (1990); Ellis (1992); Matsumura (2001); Aciba (2003); Hassall (2006) as well as others (not a definitive list). Among these studies, only a few will be subject to this review, since longitudinal studies do not fall within our scope of interest. Yet, a few influential studies will be reviewed in this section and they are mainly the ones that provide detailed information about L2 request stages: Schmidt (1983); Ellis (1992); and Achiba (2003); therefore, they will be briefly summarised here. They reflect on the developmental nature of the acquisition of requests (insights on the developmental stages, see Chapter 5). These studies are observational ones; they offer insights about the transitions made among beginner L2 learners in which they describe the stages of development of their request-making strategies over a period of time.

The first comprehensive investigation of the development of CC is Schmidt’s (1983) well-known report on Wes, a Japanese adult learner of English, who relocated to Hawaii. This study stands out with its focus on the functional aspect of the language, examining the learner's pragmatic ability as an independent component. Schmidt's (1983) three-year longitudinal study of the acquisition of English is among the earliest studies of pragmatic development in L2 in which Schmidt observes Wes’s development of directives in his interlanguage. Wes’s early directives were found to rely on a restricted range of unanalysed request formulas, using requestive markers such as
please, and a marked transfer of Japanese sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic norms. By the end of the observational period, some of the request formula had been re-analysed and Wes started to use them productively in a more elaborate fashion using some modification devices, but some non-native features remained, however. This is comparable with the current study findings in which many learners were able to achieve substantial gains in using almost all subtypes of internal and external modification devices. It also highlights the significance of heavy exposure for a long period of time, over a period of three years, on a learner’s acquisition of language. Wes’s learning materialised with abundance of input and ample opportunity for interaction, an acquisition rich context, very much specific to some ESL learners rather than EFL ones.

Studying a different age group of learners, children were examined in another study by Ellis (1992), one of the earlier longitudinal and observational studies to explore the developmental process of requests in two beginner language learners. In her study, Ellis (1992), corresponding to Schmidt’s, investigated the development of her learners’ pragmatic competence in requests in authentic classroom setting. She observed two beginner level learners of English aged at 10 and 11 years, who arrived in London from Portugal and Pakistan, respectively. Both learners received instruction in English and their use of requests was studied over a number of terms in a classroom setting. The Portuguese boy was observed for 1 year and 3 months and the Pakistani for 2 years. This observation resulted in outcomes that suggested that initially they used a high amount of direct requests with a very few instances of external or internal modifications, restricted to the use of ‘please’ and a few grounders. Over the time, this trend
diminished to be substituted by some convention indirect requests, which had considerably improved in their production. Ellis’ findings revealed the first three stages of request making-strategies in which they started with main verbs, then formulaic expression, then they tended to employ few modification devices. They employed more of internal modification devices (10%-27%) such as the use of the politeness marker please, rather than external modification devices such as the use of grounders. Similar patterns were detected in the current study outcomes, in which many learners had the tendency to employ conventionally indirect requests (see Chapter 5). However, most of the learners manifested acquisitional patterns that were more sophisticated than those of Ellis. They tended to show gains that are comparable to the ones illustrated by Achiba’s (2003).

Similar acquisitional patterns were studied by Achiba (2003); she examined her own Japanese 7-year daughter, Yao, requestive behaviour during their 17-month stay in Australia. At the beginning, the child was found to use mainly direct requests, compatible to Ellis’ (1992) learners at their second stage. Later on, Yao demonstrated an increase in her use of conventionally indirect requests starting week 13 of their stay and onwards. According to Kasper and Rose (2002), Yao seemed to have posited more pragmatic ability than that of Ellis’ learners by the end of the observation. She employed more variety of requests: direct, indirect and conventionally indirect requests. Her use of modification devices as a developmental pattern started with her repeating herself since she was not able to modify her request, then she used more toners, grounders (reasons), and politeness marker ‘please’. Kasper and Rose (2002) discussed this
difference in performance between Ellis’ learners and Yao, and they attributed it to the difference of setting, in which Ellis observed her learners in a contrived setting, whereas Achiba observed Yao in a natural one. Combining into five developmental stages in request development, Ellis’ (1992) and Achiba’s (2003) analysis and findings evinced a five-fold stage of request development in L2. The development of the learners’ production of this study will be analysed against these developmental stages.

2.3.3.2. Cross-sectional Studies:
Aiming at enriching the acquisitional body of research, many calls were made by Bardovi-Harlig (1999, 2000) as well as Kasper and Rose (1999, 2002) among others for more developmental studies to explore these understudied areas. Among the areas that were suggested is the stages of L2 pragmatic development, L1 influence on L2 pragmatics, measurement of L2 pragmatic competence, individual and contextual variables affecting acquisition, instructional effect on acquisition (Taguchi, 2010). This is what gave rise to empirical studies that target the acquisition of L2 pragmatics. Impelled by this gap in the literature, where there is an acute need for more empirical research on acquisitional/developmental pragmatics amongst L2 learners, particularly in EFL contexts, the current study intends to contribute towards closing this gap by exploring request realisation made by Arabic learners of English as a foreign language. This study is an interventional study rather than an observational one and it adopts a cognitive perspective.

Cross-Sectional studies examine one or more realisation strategies of single or multiple speech acts qualitatively and quantitatively at different proficiency levels. A substantial
amount of this research investigates the effect of the proficiency levels on L2 speech act production, other research explores learners’ metapragmatic assessment and comprehension of speech acts (O’Keeffe et al., 2011; Jianda, 2006; Kasper & Rose, 1999). Oshtain and Blum-Kulka (1985) are among the earliest researchers who examine NNSs’ judgments of the pragmatics appropriateness from a developmental perspective.

Inspired by Kasper’s plenary talk in 1997, ‘Can Pragmatic Competence Be Taught?’ (Kasper, 1997a), empirical studies in teaching pragmatics emerged. Interventional pragmatic studies have mainly examined a fairly wide range of learning targets, including discourse markers and strategies, pragmatic routines, as well as speech acts. These studies aim at improving the learners’ pragmatic competence including their comprehension and their production. However, according to Kasper and Rose (2002:118), comprehension is “the least well-represented, with only a handful of studies done to date” in comparison to production. This might be because it is more difficult to measure (Cheng, 2010). Rose (2009), on the other hand, claims that there is a growing consensus to rigorously investigate production. This study falls under this strand of research and it aims at exploring both recognition and production as well as student voice in an undertaking that, to my best knowledge, has never been explored combined in literature so far. However, there is one study that tends to share the general concept of this current study in which the Hamouda explores refusals qualitatively and quantitatively together with the learners’ opinion about instruction in Saudia Arabia.
(Hamouda, 2014). However, in his endeavour, he explores production only, with scarce information about the learners’ comprehension.

There is growing general accord that most of the pragmatic features are teachable, reiterating that instruction in pragmatics will benefit the development of pragmatic competence (Taguchi, 2015; Takahashi, 2010a, 2010b; Uso-Juan & Martínez-Flor, 2007; Alcón-Soler, Martínez-Flor & Safont-Jordà, 2005; Rose, 2005; Rose & Kasper, 2001; Tateyama, 2001). These developmental studies among others have shown a stable result that the learners’ repertoires of pragmatic routines and other linguistic means of speech act realisation are likely to expand and become enriched with instruction (Taguchi, 2015; Takahashi, 2010a, 2010b, Martínez-Flor & Fukuya, 2005; Rose, 2005; Kasper & Rose, 1999). The following review of the instructional studies will not follow a chronological route; it will highlight only apical studies from 1980s until present time. It will also emphasise some major conceptual shifts of tide in developmental pragmatics, interventional studies driven by cognitive perspective of L2 learning rather than the sociocultural one. This review will touch upon the seminal studies with a special focus on request as a speech act and foreign language as a context. Studies that are included in this review are the ones which employ an intervention, with pre-post interventional design, with sufficient description concerning the intervention, the teaching methods, and the outcomes of the intervention. Exploring the role of instruction in pragmatics, some researchers have pursued this investigation and whether instruction in pragmatics is effective and if there are any gains that may be achieved due to pragmatic intervention (Taguchi, 2015; Takahashi, 2001). The work of other researchers has focused on examining the instructional methods that are likely to
improve this development (Taguchi, 2011; Takahashi, 2010a; Jeon & Kaya, 2006; Rose, 2005) offering informed decision on how to incorporate pragmatics instruction into classroom practices. They revealed the most effective teaching methods that can help in fostering pragmatic competence and retaining the knowledge that has been gained. These will be the two driving lines of thinking that will guide this review.

With reference to the role of pragmatics instruction, many researchers have drawn on the cognitive hypotheses underlying research in ILP including that of Schmidt’s (1993, 1995, 2001) Noticing Hypothesis, Sharwood Smith’s (1991, 1993) Input Enhancement, Swain’s (1985, 1995, 2000) Output Hypothesis, and Bialystok’s (1993) Two-Dimensional Model of L2 Proficiency Development. These researchers flesh out how to foster NNSs’ pragmatic competence and enable learners to become effective communicators in the TL according to Norouzian and Eslami (2016); Reza and Alikhani (2016). Others researchers have been informed by the sociocultural perspective of L2 pragmatic development, whereas others have been driven by the psycholinguistic vantage point (Ohta, 2001, 2005). This review will restrict itself to the cognitive perspective with special focus on Schmidt’s (1993,1995, 2001) Noticing Hypothesis as well as Sharwood Smith’s (1991,1993) Input Enhancement.

A considerable bulk of research in the area of ILP and particularly cross-sectional research has contributed to the study of the realisation of request strategies at different proficiency levels, a burgeoning area of inquiry. Scarcella (1979) is one of the earliest examples of cross-sectional developmental studies in pragmatics. It is an exploratory study that aims at investigating the politeness strategies and features by L1 and L2
speakers’ production. It also aspires to identify which strategies were difficult in acquiring in two speech acts: invitations and requests. The study was an observational rather than an interventional one, yet it is reviewed because it explored Arabic L2 learners. Ten adult beginners and ten advanced Arabic EFL learners of English participated in this study and they were compared to six American English NSs. Participants role-played three video-taped open situations, in which they were featured speaking to people denoted as superiors, equal familiairs or subordinates using politeness strategies. Findings showed that advanced learners had gradually approximated NSs’ use of most of the speech act realisation strategies with a wide range of strategies along with improved proficiency. However, beginners were noted to employ rather limited range of politeness strategies in their production and they relied on direct imperatives with attention getters with no sensitivity to the social context, such as “Please, don’t bring your wife” (Scarcella, 1979: 278). The use of inclusive ‘we’ was noticed to be indicative of a later stage. Another outcome that Scarcella highlighted was that advanced Arabic learners of English used more negatively polite requests than their NSs counterparts such as their use of hints with their superiors and subordinates in status rather than their status equals, whereas, there was less evidence of sociopragmatic variation. With regard to their use of internal and external modification strategies, she emphasised the emergence of some alerters such as ‘Excuse me’ or politeness markers as in ‘please’. These findings suggest that some of these features might surface early in the L2 acquisitional process, whereas others are indicative of a later stage in the learning process. It also indicates the learners’ repertoire of pragmatic routines and pragmalinguistics to realise a speech act tends to expand in
correspondence to their proficiency level increase. Some of these outcomes are parallel to the findings of the current study, many learners of this study were detected to overuse the politeness marker ‘please’ at an early stage of their request development, a quintessential pattern of an Arabic learner of English. Similarly, some learners managed to employ hints with superiors, but none of them were seen to utilise them with their subordinates.

Claiming the precedence of pragmalinguistics over sociopragmatics in the early stages of pragmatic development in L2 development, Rose (2000) carried out an investigation to examine the developmental patterns and situational variation of three speech acts. She examined young learners in three groups of primary school students at ages ranging among 7, 9, and 11 years old in Hong Kong, China. Employing a 30-item cartoon oral production task (COPT), she elicited request, apologies, and compliment responses. To explore the possibility of pragmatic transfer from Cantonese COPT, data were collected in Cantonese as baseline data. The participants were provided with a tape recorder and they were asked to record what they would say in English or to mention the item number if they had nothing to say. They were allowed to opt out if they wanted to; however, opting out meant intentional non-performance after considering the pertinent contextual factors, or inability to perform due to limited proficiency or limited familiarity with a particular situation. Findings evinced several developmental patterns that emerged including the learners’ choice of request strategy, exceptionally in the movement from direct to conventionally indirect request strategies. They also used higher frequency of supportive moves, and use of adjuncts with apologies and
compliment responses for the oldest of the three groups. However, there was little evidence of sociopragmatic development given the lack of situational sensitivity to variation for any of the speech acts studied. No transfer from Cantonese was detected. Moreover, COPT is seen as a useful tool to elicit pragmatic production in primary schools. Another noteworthy feature that Rose mentioned was the limitation she had had with the little demographic information provided, regarding the participants’ exposure to English through their English-speaking domestic helpers, parents’ English proficiency, and attitudes to English. In addition, there was a lack of homogeneity with reference to the English proficiency. These findings can be set in contrast with the current study, in which many learners of the current study bestowed some sociopragmatic development in their wide use of modification devices. They also were seen to transfer many features of their L1 in their L2 context (see Chapter 5).

Later in 2007, other cross-sectional research emerged, exploring the use of speech act realisation strategies by learners at advanced and beginning proficiency levels. Félix-Brasdefer (2007) investigated the development of requests in face-to-face interactions at different proficiency levels including low-proficiency level. Forty-five American learners of Spanish participated in this study, also in an EFL context. They were assigned to three groups: beginning, intermediate, and advanced, with 15 learners in each. Data were collected using open role-plays in four request situations. Request head-acts were analysed qualitatively according to levels of directness (direct, conventional indirect, non-conventional indirect) as well as internal and external modification devices. Findings revealed that the beginner group showed little
competence in situational variation producing the largest number of direct requests. They realised their requests using ‘verbless’ requests, need statements, imperatives, and requests in which the main verb was an infinitive. In contrast, advanced and intermediate learners showed a decline in their use of direct requests along with a strong preference for conventionally indirect requests in formal and informal situations. Félix-Brasdefer identified four stages of pragmatic development which provided a better picture of L2 speech performance. This study also addressed the issue of the ‘primacy of pragmatics’ over grammar in expressing pragmatic intent. These findings can be set in comparison to the current study's outcomes, in which the majority of the learners showed a strong tendency to employ conventionally indirect requests.

The aforementioned cross-sectional developmental studies examined learners at different levels of proficiency. They gathered evidence that attests that learners at different proficiency levels produce different pragmatic production, not only at advanced levels but also for beginners according to the previous study of Rose (2000) together with Kasper (1997a, b); Bardovi-Harlig (2001); Rose and Kasper (2001); Matsumura (2003); Félix-Brasdefer (2007) as well as Xiao (2015) among others. They claim that the higher the level of the learners' proficiency, the more firmly they come to grips and produce the target pragmatic features with a wider range of strategies. However, their production is seen to still lag behind their NSs counterparts' production according to Bardovi-Harlig (1999). As previously mentioned, even advanced learners demonstrate gaps in their performance when compared to NSs according to Ishihara and Cohen, A. (2014). This argument, then, gives rise to question whether instruction is beneficial and
needed at all proficiency levels. Little sustained instructional research was produced in the 1980s on the effect of instruction on development of L2 pragmatic competence except for that of House and Kasper (1981) and Wildner-Bassett (1984, 1986). During the 1990s decade, a small body of interventional pragmatic research and dozens of studies emerged. In this review of the literature particular attention is assigned to the effectiveness of instruction in pragmatics.

To start with, regarding the learners’ recognition/comprehension of speech acts, an area that is claimed to be understudied according to Kasper and Rose (2000), the research of Olshtain and Blum-Kulka (1985) is among the earliest attempts to explore NNSs’ evaluation of pragmatic appropriateness from a developmental perspective. To cater for the paucity of research in the development of pragmatic awareness, some researchers explored EFL learners within the realms of the pragmatics comprehension, in an attempt to examine the efficiency of instruction in facilitating pragmatic development. Eslami-Rasekh et al. (2004) claim that pragmatic competence is amenable to instruction even in EFL settings supporting metapragmatic instruction and discussion. They substantiate considerable comprehension improvement in EFL contexts after pragmatic instruction. Eslami-Rasekh and her colleagues investigated the effectiveness of explicit metapragmatic intervention on the speech act comprehension of advanced EFL learners in requesting, apologising, and complaining. In their enquiry, they employed a quasi-experimental design with a pre-and post-test structure. Sixty-six Iranian undergraduate students in their last year of study in the field of TEFL participated in this study. They were engaged in productive class activities using pair-work and group work
after they role-played scenarios. They also received teacher-fronted discussions and they had to complete other pragmatic-oriented tasks. To measure the effect of instruction on the learners’ comprehension, a multiple choice pragmatic comprehension test was devised. Baseline data for English were collected from 30 American English speakers. On analysing the data, results evinced that the learners’ speech act comprehension improved significantly on the post-test in comparison to the control group, and that pragmatic instruction was effective even in EFL settings. It worth noting that this study does not deal with the ‘sequence’ of acquiring speech act patterns and strategies which does not provide with much evidence of the learners’ development. In contrast, the current study provides much evidence on the learners’ developmental sequence by assigning the learners’ production on the five-fold stage of development.

Adding to the limited but burgeoning body of research on L2 pragmatic development, attention shifts from the west side of the world to the non-western languages to some other EFL contexts, to Iran. Another empirical study was conducted by Eslami and Eslami-Rasekh (2008) who investigated the two speech acts of request and apology. Sixty-six Iranian EFL learners of English with high instrumental motivation participated in this study. A quasi-experimental design was employed with pre-and post-intervention structure. Data were collected using a recognition task and a DCT. It is worth mentioning that the learners in both groups in the pre-test could not demonstrate their ability to identify inappropriate speech acts, yet as they had English as the focus of their careers, they were immensely motivated. These learners were exposed to some ‘input rich instruction’ to develop their pragmatic competence as part of the intervention.
Results revealed that the experimental group outperformed the control group on both the ‘awareness’ and the ‘production’ tasks, in which the experimental group’s performance was significantly higher in the post-intervention rather than that in the pre-intervention. Yet, the control group’s performance on the pre-test and post-test did not change. This suggests that the learners’ awareness as well as production abilities of speech acts improve (significantly) as a result of the intervention. The pertinent findings suggest that there are certain pragmatic features (pragmalinguistic & sociopragmatic) that do not develop sufficiently without instruction including metapragmatic instruction in speech act patterns, rules and strategies, even with high levels of motivation. This pattern could be compared to one of the results of the current study. HRAX is a quintessential exemplification of high levels of motivation and poor development of certain pragmatic features (see Chapters 5 & 6).

Turning to explore production, other researchers advocate the effectiveness of pragmatic instruction on the development of pragmatic competence. Safont-Jordà (2003) revealed comparable findings of contemporary research of NNSs’ approximation in quantity and quality of external modification strategies to NSs. She carried out an investigation to measure the effect of instruction on English request modifiers using a pre-test and post-test design after a certain instructional period of one semester. A group of one hundred and sixty female undergraduate Spanish EFL participants role-played scenarios. The participants were categorised into two groups: beginners and intermediate, according to their results on a language proficiency test. Moreover, they received instruction that involved role-play practice together with some awareness-
raising activities. Data were collected using an appropriateness judgment task (AJT) as well as a WDCT, which were administered in the pre-and the post-test. Results demonstrated a significant increase in the participants’ use of modification devices in the post-test, after receiving the instruction. The gains, particularly, involved a significant increase in the use of attention getters and the use of politeness marker ‘please’. However, the learners’ use of grounders or expanders did not witness considerable growth. Safont-Jordà noted that the learners demonstrated a tendency to employ external modification devices rather than internal modification devices. She attributed this disposition to the syntactical complexity of the internal modification devices, which is likely to have deterred the learners from acquiring these devices. This suggests the importance of developing the L2 grammatical competence at an early stage (Kasper & Rose, 2002). Safont-Jordà suggests that for these learners to acquire more complex pragmatic forms, they might need more linguistic capabilities in grammar and syntax. Another significant outcome that was revealed by Safont-Jordà was that intermediate learners employed a highly marked amount of external modification and internal modification devices rather than learners at the beginner level, although proficiency was not the goal of that study. This outcome suggests the encouraging impact of the instruction on the participants’ pragmatic development at a higher level of proficiency. These results correspond with that of Achiba (2003) and Ellis’s (1992) third stage of request development. In comparison to the findings of the current study, the majority of the learners employed almost the full range of external and internal modification devices employed by NSs except for strong hints.
More recently, a range of studies explored pragmatic intervention and the extent to which the teachability of L2 speech acts, among other target pragmatic features, was influenced by the nature of the intervention such as inductive-deductive. With the Spanish EFL context explored further, Martínez-Flor among others, attempted to examine the effectiveness of inductive-deductive instruction on learners’ use of appropriate request modifiers. Martínez-Flor (2008) advocates the value of audio-visual input as a source of pragmatic input while she explored the efficacy of instruction on learners’ awareness of requests of Spanish EFL learners using film excerpts. A group of thirty-eight Spanish EFL learners of English role-played scenarios. The utilised intervention lasted for three two-hour sessions, which involved activities using inductive and deductive approaches of instruction. She investigated the frequency of modification devices in requests using a pre-post-intervention structure. The participants role-played eight situations that were similar to those appearing in film excerpts to raise learners’ awareness of pragmalinguistic forms and sociopragmatic factors that had bearing on the different types of linguistic realisations in requests. They received materials that included contextualised examples of request moves. Results showed gains in request modifiers which improved from 25.6% to 74.4%, which indicated that the learners made use of a higher number of internal and external modifiers as well as a wider variety of mitigating devices in their requestive behaviour. Findings suggested that learners not only used more request modifiers, but that they were more varied; they employed all different subtypes of internal and external modification devices. These findings indicate the effectiveness of the inductive-deductive method of instruction. These outcomes are
parallel to the results of the current study, in which most of the learners used different subtypes of internal and external modification devices.

With special interest in the pragmatic features that are responsive to learning and thus could be targeted in teaching, Fukuya (2002) carried out an investigation to explore the categories of modification devices in requests that are most amenable to learning. Three categories of downgraders were under investigation, namely: external modification devices (grounders, disarmers, and preparators), internal modification devices syntactical downgraders (interrogatives, aspects, and conditionals), and lexical downgraders (politeness markers, downtoners, and hedges). A group of twenty adult ESL students at Hawaii University participated in this study. They received the instruction that included explicit teacher-fronted instruction and a combination of activities including watching excerpts of films such as *Forest Gump* conjoined with discussion activities and worksheets analysing the request and the pertinent contextual variables. Data were gathered using WDCT and role-plays and they were analysed using the Blum-Kulka *et al.* (1989) coding scheme. Furthermore, a t-test was employed to compare the frequency of use of the downgraders and an ANOVA was used to compare the frequencies of three downgraders. Inconclusive evidence was revealed of the amenability of downgraders as pragmatic target features for instruction. On analysing the data, Fukuya found that downtoners, disarmers, and the combination of past tense-aspect, and conditional clause tended to be the easiest for intermediate L2 learners to learn in comparison to the rest of the downgraders. Finally, she suggested further research into the teachability of pragmatic aspects including downgraders. Similarly, the findings of the current study illustrate that almost all categories of
modification devices in requests substantially benefited from instruction. Most of the learners were able to show development on most of the categories at various levels; however, they tended to follow a certain sequence of acquisition based on the saliency of these pragmatic features in the provided input and the learners’ level and allocation of this noticing (Macrory, 2007).

Moving to the challenges that impede learners’ development in their L2 learning, Tanaka and Oki (2015) claim that the learners themselves are able to identify the challenges that they encounter in developing well-balanced CC. They attest the learners’ encouraging perception of the raising awareness tasks as useful and effective. Tanaka and Oki were set out to investigate the effects of explicit instruction on Japanese EFL learners’ pragmatic awareness using online DCT. A group of forty-six Japanese EFL college students were exposed to scenes featuring particular speech acts extracted from American TV drama. They also received explicit instruction in these speech acts involving five-part tasks that they had to complete in five successive classes using an e-portfolio system and sharing their learning outcomes. Their pragmatic awareness was evaluated pre-and post-instruction using an online DCT. Findings revealed that the learners’ pragmatic judgments and awareness substantially benefited from instruction. Their learning outcomes showed that they were not able to develop well-balanced CC, because they were challenged in their grammatical competence which mismatched their pragmatic knowledge. Although the learners were disposed to support the awareness raising activities as effective, they still struggled with their grammatical and lexical knowledge. This outcome that the learners have difficulties
in both correctness and appropriateness of language use suggests that EFL instructors should conduct classes that balance grammatical and pragmatic aspects of the language to ensure the learners’ development of well-balanced CC. This finding is echoed in one of the results of the current study in which some learners such as YGAX and YLAX among others performed poorly in with respect to their grammatical competence; however, in most of the cases the intensity of this deficiency did not impede communication.

More recently, a growing number of scholars and practitioners from various foreign language backgrounds (such as the Spanish, the Arabic, the Chinese, the Japanese, the Iranian contexts) investigated the role of instruction in pragmatics for teaching and learning purposes, such as Reza and Alikhani (2016) among many other researchers. Reza and Alikhani (2016) explored the effect of instruction on Iranian advanced EFL learners’ development of requests as a speech act. A group of sixty-two female participants were employed in this study and they were assigned to two intact classes. Using a quasi-experimental design, they examined the participants’ recognition and production of requests using MCDCTs and WDCTs, respectively. The intervention used with the experimental group involved excerpts of a movie together with variety of activities that ranged from awareness-raising tasks, to explicit meta-pragmatic explanations as well as role-plays. The activities highlighted the sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic features pertinent to the movie excerpts, which were conjoined with a metapragmatic explanation offered by the teacher. Learners in the control group, however, received no instruction on the target pragmatic features. The learners of the
experimental group benefited from six 45-minute sessions over two-weeks. Findings revealed that learners in the experimental group outperformed the control group at both levels of awareness and production of requests with significant improvement. The participants showed significant decrease of direct request strategies in their post-intervention productions. The experimental group demonstrated a shift of 'point of view operation', they moved from utilisation that involved high frequency of hearer-oriented forms to ones that were more oriented to the speaker, which was deemed politer. In addition, they showed an increase of use of variety of internal and external strategies with appropriate use of these strategies. This study contributes to the body of research that lends support to the positive effect of instruction on development of pragmatic features. It also highlights that L2 pragmatics can benefit from the input-rich pragmatic instruction in fostering the learners' realisation and identification of appropriate pragmatic features along with the production of the correct pragmatic function with higher sensitivity to contextual and social limitations of the setting. These findings are parallel to the outcomes of the current study.

Shifting focus for a glimpse of an ESL context, another research explores the context of Chinese learners in the UK. Halenko and Jones (2011) investigated the effectiveness of explicit interventional treatment on facilitating pragmatic awareness and production of spoken requests in an EAP context at a British higher education institution. A group of twenty-six Chinese EFL learners of English were allocated to either an explicitly instructed group or a control group receiving no instruction. Halenko and Jones employed an experimental design with pre, post, and delayed test structure using DCT.
The intervention lasted for 12 weeks. The intervention, which the experimental group received, involved 6 hours of explicit instruction on requests focusing on the use of requests strategies in EAP contexts, which learners were likely to come across in the UK university setting. Findings revealed several key features: First, explicit instruction had positively enhanced the development of pragmatically appropriate request language; however, these gains were not retained six weeks later when the delayed post-test was administered. Secondly, in spite of the general consensus that ESL context potentially posited advantage to ESL learners’ learning and acquisition of the TL, this was not necessarily instrumental in enhancing competence (Halenko & Jones, 2011). A tenet which proposes that ESL learners should advantage from the incorporation of pragmatic instruction and find it valuable to fostering their learning and communication in similar EAP contexts.

In more recent studies, there was a noticeable trend in the use of technology-enhanced (semi) authentic tasks attempting the exciting new ventures ascribed to virtual social platforms and online space instruction in the Japanese context. Johnson and deHaan (2013) investigated the development of pragmatic competence among the Japanese learners of English using web-enhanced tools in facilitating and developing pragmatic competence, a new venture for teachers and practitioners. Johnson and deHaan attempted to develop the learners’ pragmatic competence in this study using online space. This study aimed at design and implementation of an effective approach to teaching ILP. A group of twenty-two Japanese EFL university students participated in this study using a pre-and post-intervention design. To ensure engaging the learners in
realistic interactive situations, the researchers implemented direct instruction of request and apology in an online wiki space (using Digitally enhanced Strategic Interaction (SI) sequences). The employed online space included model conversations, online wiki space, and digital video technologies. This online space furnished the learners with opportunities for reflection, peer assisted feedback, and detailed intervention from the instructor. Data were gathered via written DCTs. The findings showed that the learners became able to use language in an appropriate way after the intervention in five out of six DCT items. However, regarding accuracy only one DCT item was found to benefit, indicating that instruction is effective on appropriateness only but not on accuracy. It is argued that attaining the use of politeness strategies and appropriate discourse moves is easier to learn (macro-level semantic strategies), rather than the defined syntax of speech act forms (the micro-level syntactic strategies). These findings suggest that raising the learners’ awareness of the pragmatic aspects of the TL via these technologically-enhanced materials, has gains and is effective in developing the learners’ sensitivity towards the context, but not the precise syntax of the speech act. These findings lend support to Schmidt’s Noticing Hypothesis (1993, 1995, 2001) and to the current study’s findings, in spite of the difference of the interventional tools and materials. Aligned with the findings of this study, this outcome is comparable to our findings in terms of the learners’ precision, which tends to be delayed coming later in their learning. The general tendency is for the learners to attain frequency before they can achieve higher levels of accuracy and precision in the syntax of the speech act, the micro-level strategies.
Giving more insights to teachers and material developers, Derakhshan and Eslami (2015) inspected the effectiveness of consciousness-raising video-driven prompts on the pragmatic development of apology and request for 60 upper-intermediate Iranian learners of English. Randomly assigned in 3 groups of twenty: discussion, role-play, and interactive translation; the learners were exposed to 36 extracts including 18 requests and 18 apologies extracted from different episodes of the Flash Forward, and Stargate TV series and the film Annie Hall during six-90 minute sessions. Data were elicited using MDCT. Findings lent support to the improvement from all three types of instruction in the learners’ awareness of requests and apologies; however, the discussion group was found to outperform all groups on the Scheffe test (Scheffe test is a statistical procedure, a post-hoc test that is used in Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to determine which pairs of means are significant). The researchers related this gain to the amount of negotiation and interaction involved in discussion. The findings confirmed that pragmatic features are amenable to learning through awareness-raising activities developing the learners’ pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic competences. It lends support to instruction which familiarises learners with the similarities and the differences between their L1-TL using videos which authenticate real life situations bringing them to the classroom context.

Having established the necessity and the effectiveness of instruction in pragmatics, where evidence accumulates attesting that pragmatics can be taught and learned, other researchers turn to examine the effectiveness of the pedagogical paradigms for teaching pragmatics that are likely to facilitate L2 learning. These studies compare the
impact of teaching using explicit versus implicit teaching methods. Rose (2005) contends that the distinctive feature that distinguishes these two methods of instruction is the use of metapragmatic information designed to make the target pragmatic features salient for learners.

Regarding the proponents of the explicit method of teaching, Takahashi (2001) is an early effort which has initiated a long list of proponents to explicit method of instruction including: House (1996); Fukuya et al. (1998); Yoshimi (2001); Alcón-Soler (2005, 2007); Félix-Brasdefer (2008, 2010); Nguyen et al. (2012); Fordyce (2013) among others. Takahashi (2001) explored the effect of four different forms of intervention on the learning of bi-clausal request forms of Japanese EFL learners. She employed explicit intervention and three implicit ones, namely: form-comparison, form-search, and meaning-focused. A group of one hundred thirty-eight Japanese EFL college students were assigned to four groups. The study employed a quasi-experimental design with a pre-and post-intervention evaluation. The explicit instruction group were given a classical grammar lecture followed by translation exercises and they were provided with hand-outs that included metapragmatic information on the request forms. The first implicit group received implicit instruction paired with input enhancement techniques, in which learners had to compare their own WDCT responses with transcripts of NSs role-playing the same scenarios. The second implicit group was required to search for native-like request forms or strategies in role plays, but input was not supplemented by the learners’ own production for contrast. The last implicit group was provided with a meaning-focused task that did not focus on drawing the learners’ attention to the
request forms. Findings revealed that only the explicit group outperformed all the implicit groups demonstrating substantial learning gains in the use of bi-clausal request forms at the post-test. Findings showed that in the post-test, the learners of the three implicit groups demonstrated high levels of lack confidence while formulating the target forms (bi-clausal request forms) even when they were able to produce them in the post-test task performance. This outcome indicated that the learners' mastery and competence is still incomplete even after the intervention in comparison to the explicit group who manages to perform the target forms with higher levels of lack of confidence. These outcomes suggest that superiority of explicit condition of instruction over the implicit one, which is the current study embraces as a major feature of the instruction method.

Later on, Alcón-Soler (2005) presented another study which lends substantial support to explicit methods of instruction. In her study, Alcón-Soler examined the efficacy of instruction in pragmatics on the learners’ knowledge and the ability to use request strategies, with a special focus on investigating two pedagogical paradigms (explicit versus implicit conditions). A group of one hundred and thirty-two Spanish EFL learners participated in this study. The study employed a quasi-experimental design with a pre- and post-intervention evaluation. The participants were randomly assigned to three groups: explicit, implicit and control. The intervention involved exposing the learners to requests in excerpts taken from different episodes of the American TV series Stargate. The explicit group was provided with instruction that embraced direct awareness-raising tasks and written metapragmatic feedback related to the use of appropriate requests, whereas the implicit group received request strategies that were typographically
enhanced besides a set of activities that employed implicit awareness-raising. Data were gathered using written role-plays and they were scored independently. Results showed that learners’ awareness in both experimental groups benefited from instruction, and they outperformed the control group on the post-test. However, the explicit group was noted to outperform its implicit counterpart obtaining a mean score that was higher, marking a significant difference in the request production of the two groups. This outcome indicated that although an improvement in learners’ appropriate use of requests occurred after the instructional period, the explicit group revealed an improvement over the implicit one.

Alcón-Soler (2007) provided further empirical evidence on the effectiveness of consciousness-raising tasks for pragmatic learning and how explicit and implicit instructional methods benefited the development of the learners’ pragmatic awareness. Alcón-Soler examined the interventional effects of explicit and implicit methods of teaching on Spanish EFL learners’ acquisition of request forms using a quasi-experimental design with pre- and post-test measures. A group of one hundred and thirty-two learners participated in this study and they were divided into three groups: explicit (focus on forms) group, implicit (focus on form) group, and a control group. The former group received metapragmatic information regarding request, whereas the latter group received consciousness-raising tasks in which requests and the pertinent pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic features were emboldened and capitalised, using input enhancement techniques with no metapragmatic explanation. The explicit group was given a script and the learners were required to identify request forms in the scripts
and provide justification for their choices which involved metapragmatic discussions. The control group did not receive any instruction on the use of requests. The results demonstrated that both experimental groups outdid the control one in the post-test with no significant difference in terms of gains in awareness. This outcome suggested that both explicit and implicit interventions are sufficiently effective. However, it was reported that the explicit group maintained their gains in the delayed post-test, 3 weeks after the intervention. Takahashi (2010a) argues that this may be attributed to the greater depth of processing that the explicit group is engaged in where the learners are required to rely on their cognitive capacities, pushing them to notice the target forms more than the implicit one. This outcome suggests that housing both conditions of instruction as followed in the current study should yield considerable benefits for L2 learners, expecting more robust gains even in delayed post-tests.

Maintaining attention to the importance metapragmatic explanation, other scholars such as Mirzaei and Esmaeili (2013) investigated the impact of explicit instruction on EFL learners’ awareness and production of three speech acts of request, apology, and complaint. A group of two hundred and ten Iranian EFL college students majoring in English participated in this study and sixty NSs of American English. The intervention lasted for about 12 weeks. They adopted pre-and post-test plan with a quasi-experimental design using MDCT and WDCT to assess their achievement in L2 pragmatics. Their results evinced significant benefits made by the experimental groups receiving instruction which sustained the claim that explicit metapragmatic instruction enhances ILP development. Most specifically, explicit metapragmatic instruction in
speech act patterns, rules, and strategies were revealed to have improved the Iranian EFL students' speech act comprehension as well as production abilities significantly. Hence, consciousness-raising can be influential in acquiring pragmatic competence. Similar to the current study, they examine instruction in pragmatics in EFL context. They lend support to the fact that pragmatic instruction has a facilitative role in pragmatic competence as evaluated via the learners’ pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic competences on M/WDCTs. They also lend support to both metapragmatic explanation as one explicit technique of instruction as well as consciousness-raising technique as an implicit one.

With inconclusive results concerning whether the explicit or the implicit method of teaching is more effective, Fukuya et al.’s (1998) results showed negligible difference in favour of the explicit method of instruction over the implicit one. They claim that sociopragmatic knowledge is difficult to attain through less explicit intervention. They attribute their failure to find instructional gains due to the length of the treatment, demonstrating trends across groups which might refer that the instruction is about to have an effect on the learners if the duration of the intervention is to be extended. Fukuya et al. (1998) focused on the speech act of request in English using ‘interaction enhancement techniques’ in ESL context. Three groups were assigned: one explicit (focus on forms), one implicit (focus on form), and a control group. A group of twenty-seven mixed L1 participants were assigned to three subgroups: explicit group (8), implicit group (11), and control group (8). The intervention was brief; it lasted for 4 weeks and it involved enhanced intervention. The participants role-played request
scenarios which was followed by meaning-focused activities discussing communicative goals and the contextual factors involved. The instructor employed implicit reactive feedback as a means of expressing sociopragmatic failure during role-play interaction, in which she showed a sad face once students made sociopragmatic errors. The explicit group received explicit sociopragmatic information besides the sad face technique during the interaction. On the other hand, the implicit group received the sad face technique and the instructor repeated the inappropriate utterance. Data were gathered using WDCT in the pre-test and the post-test. Results showed almost no significant difference among the three treatment groups: the explicit, the implicit, and the control. The difference, however, in favour of the explicit group, was subtle with 0.17 Standard Deviation. Fukuya and her co-authors assumed that the brevity of the intervention together with its nature made it unlikely to achieve any significant gains. They also expounded that the intervention should have had two additional NSs who were supposed to provide the learners with positive feedback to their sociopragmatic failures, meanwhile the instructors were performing with the two groups. These inconclusive findings indicate that further research should be conducted in these areas.

Contradicting the aforementioned conclusions, other researchers, proponents of the implicit method of teaching, provided counter-evidence to the advantage of explicit method of instruction, Fukuya and Zhang (2002) are among the scholars who lend support to implicit instruction. Exploring EFL Chinese learners of English, Fukuya and Zhang (2002) employed implicit teaching method in studying requests in which they relied on implicit feedback condition presented during ongoing interactions. They
investigated the effect of corrective feedback on EFL learners’ acquisition of the speech act of requests using DCT tasks. Fukuya and Zhang employed a pre-and post-intervention structure with a quasi-experimental design. A group of twenty-four EFL Chinese learners role-played a situation that featured making a request. Their performance received corrective feedback through meaningful communication from the instructor when they produced non-target like requests. This implicit intervention involved sensitising the learners with the non-native like request forms as well as allowing the learners opportunity to compare their forms with models of more native-like request forms and thus they were able to induce form-function-context mappings easily. Findings showed that the learners were able to achieve substantial gains in accuracy and appropriateness of the request forms on the DCT task in the post-test. These findings suggested that recasts and corrective feedback might have helped in enhancing their learning by reinforcing and activating it via feedback. The current study has made use of such findings and recommendations when planning for the intervention, in which explicit feedback is heavily present throughout the intervention.

In line with Fukuya and Zhang’s (2002) findings concerning the superiority of implicit methods of instruction to the explicit one, Li, Q. (2012) is one of the key studies which provides encouraging evidence of the primacy of implicit over explicit teaching of request acquisition. In this study Li investigated external modifications devices that downplay the illocutionary force. A group of one hundred-ninety-seven Chinese EFL learners were employed to elicit data using DCT in a pre-and post-intervention as well as delayed gains design. The intervention was conducted with three different groups
using explicit, enhanced input, and input-output as methods of teaching. All three groups role-played scenarios; in the meantime, the explicit group received metapragmatic information; the enhanced input group received the dialogues with input enhancement; and the input-output group read the dialogues (without enhancement). Findings showed that the two implicit conditions were superior to the explicit approach. It is argued that the nature of the target features might have influenced the results, targeting a universal strategy that is easily transferrable from the L1. According to Li, explicit instruction might have been counterproductive imposing a cognitive burden on the learning process. This outcome is comparable to one of this study findings in which universal strategies were easily transferrable among NNSs when awareness is raised to the benefits of their positive transfer in the TL. This is particularly true if these modification devices are semantically identified, with a formulaic structure such as ‘because...’ for grounders, ‘excuse me…’ for attention getting, and ‘please’ as politeness marker to lexically mitigate the request.

In a series of studies targeting implicit pedagogical instruction among others, Takimoto suggests that implicit interventions may be sufficient to cause positive effects on pragmatic learnability and can be equally crucial when compared to explicit metapragmatic information. Takimoto (2006) examined the relative effectiveness of two-fold input-based interventions: explicit and implicit conditions, on the realisation of requests. In realising his aim, Takimoto employed a quasi-experimental design with a pre, post delayed post-test structure. A group of forty-six Japanese EFL learners participated in this study. The explicit group was provided with two consciousness-
raising tasks which involved input processing activities that the learners had to complete and to which they received reactive explicit feedback with metapragmatic information. On the other hand, the implicit group was provided with this same consciousness-raising tasks; however, no explicit feedback was given to them. Data were collected via DCT, role-play, Appropriateness Judgment Task (AJT) via listening, and Appropriateness Judgment Task via reading. Findings revealed that both experimental groups outperformed the control one, with no significant difference between the experimental groups. Moreover, these positive gains were durable until the delayed post-test is administered 4 weeks after the treatment. These outcomes offer immense support to the benefit of implicit and explicit conditions of instruction, a proposition that was followed in the design of the intervention of the current study.

Similar results were revealed from Takimoto’s (2009) study in which he examined the effect of a three-fold intervention comparison using three pedagogical practices, namely, explicit, problem-solving and input-processing in three different groups of learners. He employed a quasi-experimental design with a pre, post delayed post-test structure. A group of sixty Japanese EFL learners participated in this study and were randomly assigned into these three groups of instruction. The intervention that was served to the problem-solving group included their analysing the request forms against some sociocultural variables besides their discussing the behavioural features of request. Data were gathered using the same measurement tools of his study in 2006: DCT, role-play, AJT via listening, and AJT via reading. The findings of Takimoto (2006, 2009) evinced that all experimental groups, including all interventional methods,
demonstrated performance that surpassed that of the control group in the post-test, and no difference was detected. These findings indicated that attention and engagement in cognitive processing are essential factors in effective implicit treatment. These factors can contribute to the knowledge of practitioners, syllabus designers and teachers (the current study is included) on how to integrate effective implicit instruction into language learning and acquisition. However, there was one exception from his previous findings in which the explicit group failed to retain their learning in the delayed post-test on one measurement, the AJT of requests via listening. It is argued that this outcome is the result of the learners’ marginal attention to the pertinent pragmatic features because the explicit group receives metapragmatic explanation and does not discover the rules on their own. He assumed that this involves low level of processing and that there was little attention assigned to the task. This argument indicates that both noticing the target forms and processing them are necessary conditions for effective instruction and thus learning. Being able to discover the rules for themselves guided the learners to formulate the form-function-context mappings easily. They were also provided with the ample chance to confirm and revise their hypotheses of the appropriate form-function-context mappings by listening to the correct forms. Thus, it could be surmised that an assortment of these implicit learning activities should produce robust pragmatic knowledge, comparable to that yielded from the explicit treatment. In summary, learners gain from each type of instruction whether it is awareness raising, explicit, implicit, or input-based; they are beneficial in fostering pragmatic understanding and production of request downgraders. Furthermore, it indicates that instruction on pragmatic features is better than no instruction for all the aforementioned studies.
The review of literature above suggests that there is a slight advantage in the explicit teaching of different speech acts over its implicit counterpart in some respects according to Takahashi (2001); Alcón-Soler (2005, 2007), and Takahashi (2010a). However, other studies such as Fukuya and Zhang (2002) and Takimoto’s series of studies claim no significant differences between the explicit and implicit teaching of pragmatic features. They report encouraging and mixed gains on attempting to capitalise on the learners’ implicit understanding of the TL pragmatic features through some forms of implicit instruction, such as input enhancement and corrective feedback.

In the same vein, Taguchi (2014: 32) opines that the implicit counterpart is only equally effective only in simplistic tasks, ones that require less demanding cognitive processes. Based on this review of the literature, it seems more effective to garner an informed eclectic model of teaching, in which explicitness-implicitness are viewed on a continuum rather than being dichotomy (Takahashi, 2010a). That is why the design of the current study, in line with that of Kim (2016), embraces an informed eclectic method.

From the review of research so far, we can draw a number of conclusions: first, learners’ proficiency level unceasingly plays an important role in the learners’ approximation to the NSs’ norms of production, especially as far as modification devices are concerned—both internally and externally. Learners’ repertoire of pragmatic routines and pragmalinguistics to realise a speech act tends to expand in correspondence to the increase in their proficiency level. Second, learners at different proficiency levels produce different pragmatic production, not only at advanced levels but also for beginners. Third, instruction in pragmatics will benefit the development of pragmatic competence including comprehension and production. There is a general consensus
that most of the pragmatic features are amenable to instruction (teachable), and that certain pragmatic features do not develop sufficiently without instruction. Fourth, sociopragmatic knowledge is more difficult to learn than the pragmalinguistic one, therefore, pragmalinguistic knowledge precedes sociopragmatic knowledge in early stages of pragmatic development. Fifth, internal modification devices are syntactically more sophisticated than external devices, thus learners tend to marshal the external ones at an earlier stage than their internal counterparts, providing that they have a firm grip of the linguistic competence. Sixth, despite the seemingly larger gains that are achieved via employing explicit instruction, it can be argued that it is more effective to utilise an informed eclectic model of teaching, in which explicitness-implicitness are viewed on a continuum rather than being dichotomous.

2.3.4. Recent Studies on Request in EFL Contexts: Focus on Arabic as L1:
The literature on NSs of Arabic performing and learning to produce requests in English has shown that many Arabs trip over hurdles when speaking English; in fact, they find it cumbersome to produce or sometimes to comprehend a speech act. This is because of their limited ability to use English language effectively in order to achieve a specific communicative purpose and to understand it in context, which in turn may lead to breakdown of communication or pragmatic failure (Thomas, 1983). On scanning the literature on the realisation of requests as a speech act, a few empirical studies looked into NSs of Arabic performance. Among the earliest endeavours in this respect are the studies conducted by Scarcella (1979) and Scarcella and Brunak (1981). Scarcella and Brunak employed beginning and advanced learners to role-play scenarios in the TL. They found that their learners acquired the linguistic forms to express politeness
according to the social norms of status before they can apply them appropriately to the communicative situations. Suggesting the vital role of language proficiency in enhancing foreign language learners’ pragmatic competence, they compared the realisation of request performance of Arabic learners and their NSs of English counterparts. Participants role-played situations including requests made to superiors, familiars, equals, and subordinates’ interlocutors. Results showed that advanced learners tended to use imperatives mainly with familiar equals and subordinates and that they employed declarative statements to superiors. Meanwhile, beginners used imperatives to all addressees regardless of social distance and power difference, implying limited pragmatic competence. These outcomes are determined to be partly in contrast with the results of the current study, in which the majority of the learners (intermediate level) relied heavily on conventionally indirect strategies downtoning them with a wide range of modification devices based on the contextual cues of the situations.

In another undertaking, El-Shazly examined requesting strategies in American English (1993). Her results indicated a tendency by Egyptian EFL learners towards using conventional indirect strategies in the form of interrogatives. El-Shazly examined Egyptian Arabic and English spoken by Egyptian L2 learners. She employed three groups as her informants in this study: American English NSs, Egyptian Arabic NSs, and Egyptian learners of English. The results of her study indicated that there were differences in the requesting strategies used by these groups, where Egyptian learners of English showed an inclination to use interrogatives. On examining modifiers, including upgraders and downgraders, Egyptian learners of English tended to use
upgraders with no disparity of employment with NSs. However, the use of downgraders was noted to be more frequently employed by NSs of Arabic when compared to NSs of English, where more than one downgrader was utilised in a single utterance. What was also exceptionally noticed in this native Arabic speakers group is their use of religious expressions as downgraders, and such expressions are iconic of the Arabic culture. These expressions were used to show emotion, closeness, and to soften the FTA; a quintessential feature of the Arabic culture whose speakers are prone to show their emotions (Wierzbicka, 1990, 2003, 2010). These results shed light on the nature of similarities and differences between Arabic and English cultures and the projected of interference and/or transfer that might be induced from the L1 on the TL.

In the same vein, another sociolinguistic investigation was undertaken into the request strategies by Umar (2004). Umar contends that Arabic people tend to use direct request strategies with lower ranking people more than NNSs. He attributes this to sociocultural reasons, as in Arabic culture using direct request with those who have a lower status is acceptable because this directness is a means for the speaker to acknowledge their status and to urge the hearers to comply with their requests. He compared two groups: One made up of 20 advanced Sudanese Arabic learners of English and the other group involved 20 NSs of English. Data were gathered using DCTs. Results of both groups revealed similar strategies were employed when addressing their request to equals or people in higher positions, where both groups relied heavily on conventionally indirect strategies. However, there was a tendency towards using more direct request strategies on the part of the Arabic group especially when requests were directed to people in
lower positions, which was a markedly different than the British sample. On analysing the use of modification devices, NSs were noticed to employ more semantic and syntactic modifiers than their Arabic counterparts due to the linguistic superiority. Even at advanced levels, Arab students showed disparity from their NS counterparts by falling back on their cultural background when formulating their request strategies. These findings suggested that Arab learners of English should be sensitised of the pragmatic differences between Arabic and English, a recommendation that is put forward by this current study as well.

On a different note, Aribi (2012) advocates Tunisian learners of English should be made aware of the socio-cultural and pragmatic differences between their L1 and English as a foreign language. He found that his participants had a tendency to use conventionally indirect strategies even in addressing their acquaintances and friends, when the ranking of imposition was worked out to be very high. In his research, he examined Tunisian EFL learners’ use of request strategies and behaviour. A group of sixty-seven female Master’s students studying in Safax participated as informants in his study. Using a DCT, they were asked to respond to six different situations in which they employed requests. On analysing the participants’ production, it was revealed that more indirect strategies were used to show respect and deference, particularly when the requestees were assumed to be of high rank or position. This feature is surmised to be a quintessential feature of Arab learners, a pattern that has been detected in the production of many learners in this current study.
One of the few interventional studies in this strand of research is that of Halim (2000). She conducted an interventional study in which she examined the effectiveness of pragmatic consciousness raising (PRC) techniques for raising learners’ awareness of pragmatic appropriateness and pragmatic instruction in the EFL classroom. She aimed to sensitise her learners to context-based variation in language use using a quasi-experimental design with a pre-and post-test structure. Forty Egyptian EFL undergraduate learners of English were assigned to four groups: two experimental and two control groups. They received PRC activities dealing with sociopragmatic conditions and pragmalinguistic factors governing pragmatic use and function in eight speech acts for two weeks. Data were gathered using a judgment task which was administered pre- and post the intervention besides conducting retrospective focus interviews. These interviews were run before and after the intervention to both the experimental groups as well as the NSs to explore the rationale behind their judgments on the task. The returns of the judgment task were compared to the baseline data, elicited from NSs. Results showed that the PRC technique had noticeable positive effects on the learners’ pragmatic competence. They were able to accurately recognise pragmatically appropriate/inappropriate utterances, and they approximated NSs’ in their pragmatic judgments. They made informed decisions about the appropriateness of an utterance based on the contextual pragmatic parameters with reference to the level of directness in context. These findings suggested the positive effect of pragmatic instruction using pragmatic consciousness raising technique.

Turning to another interventional study among the available few, Hamouda (2014) carried out a pragmalinguistic investigation into refusals made by Saudi EFL learners.
The aim of the study was to investigate the effect of explicit instruction on performing refusal as a speech act using a quasi-experimental design. The types of the strategies employed when refusing requests, invitations, suggestions, and offers of a higher, an equal, and a lower status interlocutors were examined. The learners’ opinions regarding the explicit instruction in teaching English refusals was under investigation as well. Hamouda employed forty-four participants who were randomly assigned to two groups: the interventional group and the control one. Participants in the interventional group received instruction in the form of conversations from an English textbook called ‘Headway’ where refusals were identified. Data were collected using WDCTs before and after the intervention as well as self-reports. To analyse the data quantitatively, a t-test was used, besides a qualitative discourse analytic approach that was used to investigate the learning results in the intervention group. Results evinced that the interventional group outperformed the control group with reference to their pragmatic competence. Findings drawn from the qualitative analyses showed that indirect refusal strategies were more popular than direct strategies for the intervention group. As for the learners’ opinions about the instruction, it turned out to be supportive. The findings suggested encouraging results regarding the use of explicit pragmatic instruction to develop learners’ pragmatic competence and positive perception.

On inspecting the above-mentioned studies, it appears that Arab learners of English do not have the awareness of the pragmatic differences between Arabic and English. Most of these studies tended to deal with requests from a comparative perspective rather than a developmental one, except for the last two. They sketch how Arabic learners of
English realise requests in their communication, their linguistic abilities, the strategies they prefer, and the indelible influence of their culture on their application of the politeness (Aubed, 2012). Nevertheless, a gap in the literature is evident particularly in relation to interventional strand of research. Having mentioned that research on Arabic learners’ L2 pragmatic development is limited, it has been also found that there is little research that explores the Arabic learners' of English attitude towards their pragmatic acquisition experience.

2.3.5. Recent Studies on Pragmatics Instruction and Learners’ Attitudes:
Brown (2000: 60-61) states:

[A]s human beings learn to use a second language, they also develop a new mode of thinking, feeling and acting- a second identity. This new 'language-ego' intertwined with the second language can easily create within the learner a sense of fragility, a defensiveness, a raising of inhibitions. (Brown, 2000: 60-61)

He further emphasises the crisis these learners undergo is within the true sense of helplessness and humiliation they suffer while communicating. They endure being hampered in a face-to-face interaction by lacking words or being deficient in words or structures to express themselves. He (2000: 64) claims that language and culture are intricately intertwined and that is why each time we tutor a SL, a whole complex system of cultural values, customs, and means of thinking, feeling plus acting are imparted. He further contends the learners' confusion in developing this additional social identity in the L2 culture is only a normal and natural process. In line with Brown, Lo Castro (2001: 71) attests:

...language learning involves the self-identity of the learner as an individual with a personal history and as a member of a group, a society, and a culture, therefore, the input provided may not become intake due to reasons that implicate the learner's beliefs and values as well as features of the sociocultural context. 

Lo Castro (2001: 71)
He (2001: 70) argues, “the learners' willingness to adopt L2 pragmatics may be particularly sensitive to their attitudes towards the L2 target community and their motivation for learning a L2.” Schumann (1993) claims social-psychological and affective factors in general are widely believed to be key features of L2 learning and acquisition. It aspires at identifying their fragilities and the causes of their sense of being overwhelmed in an attempt to lower their affective filters to make room for the realisation of their language learning experience and their prospective engagement in real life communication. Bearing this purpose in mind, uncovering learners' attitudes towards their emerging intercultural competence should facilitate their L2 learning and acquisition by investing enough time, effort and attention to the TL via using a wide range of individualised strategies to establish an L2 self-identity compatible with the TL. Researchers, practitioners, and educators in L2 learning and acquisition advocate cross-cultural understanding and awareness as a highly important facet of language learning. They highlight the importance of cultural connotations and sociolinguistic aspects as an integral part of the process of acculturation in aspiration to acquire L2 values and customs to be able to approximate TL models and L2 communicative norms to communicate successfully (Kim et al., 2012). Thomas (1983: 96) attests that it is the role of instructors and L2 tutors to equip their learners with the necessary knowledge to be able to express themselves in exactly the way they deem appropriate to do so: be it rudely, tactfully, or in an elaborately polite manner. What we want to prevent is their being inadvertently rude, deferential or subservient. In other words, she proposes that learners should be furnished with the linguistic and cultural tools to empower them to make their own informed decisions about how to use the TL, a philosophy that this
current study holds onto where the learner’s identity is never compromised or subdued for some other culture (Giles, Coupland and Coupland, 1991).

Potter and Wetherell (1987) claim that attitudes are not correspondingly viewed by the researchers and their informants; in fact, their notions of attitudes may be at odds. That is why, in this current study, it is deemed important that the researcher determines what it is meant by the learners’ attitudes by giving the participants a set of useful questions to trigger them to keep their logs updated. These questions provided them with an analytic framework against which they were able to assess their own attitudes (cited in Lo Castro, 2001: 72). Hence, these questions do not put a specific locus of concern be it the learners’ emerging social self-identities or Peirce’s (1995) notion of investment or Gillette’s (1994) concept of L2 users’ desire to be viewed as competent users of the TL by the L2 community. In fact, these questions open up issues that might significantly influence the learners’ attitudes towards their language learning. Investigating the role of learners’ attitudes on their pragmatic development is essential to examine the elaborate relationships that evolve meanwhile constructing new identities in the TL. This emerging identity, if not facilitative, might act as a stumbling block to the learners’ ability to accommodate to the interactional patterns, linguistic behaviours, and the communicative norms of the TL community.

There is little research that has explored learners’ attitudes towards their language learning experience and knowledge in foreign language context, let alone approaching attitudes of Arabic learners of English. Among the few scholars who explored learners’
perception of the TL norms is Hinkel (1996) who investigated the effect that perceptions of L2 pragmalinguistic norms can have on the learners’ acquisition. She claims that the NNSs’ recognition of L2 pragmatic norms do not match their willingness to adopt L2 communicative practices. She attests NNSs are not always willing to follow L2 conventions and norms, they view them with a critical eye, and they tend to compare them to their L1 norms. In her attempt, Hinkel employed two hundred forty speakers of Chinese, Indonesian, Korean, Japanese, and Arabic as her participants. Her respondents had to complete a questionnaire containing 29 statements considering the various aspects of L2 politeness, inspecting their perceptions of L2 pragmalinguistic norms. On a 10-point Likert scale, NSs of American English ranked the respondents’ statements with reference to their agreement or disagreement. Results evinced that NNSs showed evident recognition of L2 pragmalinguistic norms accepted in the U.S., yet, they were not always willing to follow them. These findings indicate that the learners’ perceptions of and attitudes toward an L2 affect their language acquisition, a tenable interpretation to some learners’ failure to adopt L2 cultural norms and values.

Turning to the few studies that have investigated L2 learners’ attitude towards pragmatic instruction are that of Liu (2007), Chen (2009), Rafieyan et al. (2013), Kim (2016), as well as this current study among others. Liu (2007) investigated the effectiveness of explicit pragmatic instruction on the acquisition of request forms as well as the learners’ perceptions toward pragmatic instruction. The group of one hundred and eighteen undergraduate Taiwanese participants were categorised into three subgroups, namely: the control group, the experimental group, and the computer-mediated communication
(CMC) group. The control group received no instruction, whereas the experimental one was provided explicit pragmatic instruction in a classroom setting, and the CMC group received instruction via e-mail and Web-CT discussion with English NS partners. Findings revealed that the two experimental groups developed supportive attitude towards the instruction and they referred to it as “practical and essential for their learning of English” (Liu, 2007: 89). Liu states that the majority of the participants attested that pragmatic instruction aided them in communication in L2, and they argued that the intervention equipped them with more knowledge into L2 pragmatics. These outcomes lend support to the benefits of pragmatic instruction and its role in facilitating effective communication and positive attitudes.

Similar patterns were revealed by Chen (2009) whose participants embraced supportive attitude towards pragmatics instruction, they further suggested including audio-visuals to enhance the utilised materials. Chen examined learners’ perceptions of instruction in L2 pragmatics using solicited self-reports. Forty Taiwanese participants received instruction on the speech act of complaints with the use of a chapter in a conversation textbook as well as hand-outs using raising-awareness activities that provided the learners with metapragmatic explanation concerning the pertinent social variables. On analysing the learners’ self-reports, it was revealed that instruction in L2 pragmatics is beneficial and that most of the learners held an encouraging attitude towards pragmatic instruction. A finding that is comparable to the outcomes of this current study.
In the realms of pragmatic comprehension, similar patterns were revealed by Rafieyan et al. (2013). Rafieyan and his colleagues claim that raising the language learners' awareness concerning the cultural features of the TL society and making them interested in learning those cultural features is strategic to determining their level of pragmatic comprehension. They attest a positive attitude toward the TL culture enhances language learners' level of pragmatic comprehension. They examined the relationship between attitude toward incorporating TL culture into classroom instruction and the development of pragmatic comprehension using pre-and post-test design. Thirty-two intermediate level Malaysian language learners participated in this study. Using a Likert scale attitude questionnaire and two pragmatic comprehension tests, data were gathered at two points, pre-and post-test. The findings indicate learners who embrace a positive attitude toward learning TL cultural features both form an overall perspective and from a specific (affective, cognitive, behavioural) perspective, tended to have a higher level of pragmatic comprehension. In addition, they found that integrating cultural features of the TL community into classroom instruction improved language learners' level of pragmatic comprehension. These findings suggest furnishing foreign language classrooms with cultural information of the TL.

More recently, patterns of motivation and supportive attitudes towards instruction in pragmatics were reported by Kim (2016). In her study, she claims that the learners are motivated and that they voiced their need for pragmatic instruction to facilitate their communication in L2. She purports that they embraced encouraging perception that pragmatic instruction fostered their communication skills, improved their pragmatic
awareness on intercultural differences, as well as instilling confidence in their English interactions. She carried out an investigation into the learners’ perception toward the pragmatic instruction. Fifty-two university students with various subject specialisms received explicit pragmatic instruction with reference to four speech acts (requests, refusals, compliments, and apologies) over a period of 9 weeks during the regular class hours. Kim aimed at improving the learners’ pragmatic awareness as well as pragmatic competence. Data were gathered using a questionnaire and the learners’ reflection journals. She embraced an eclectic design to analyse the learners’ perceptions. Findings showed that both the intermediate and low proficiency groups showed encouraging perception in terms of the four major categories: interest, usefulness, importance, and motivation out of five where difficulty was not included. However, more than fifty percent of the participants from the low level group found that learning L2 pragmatics was challenging due to the convolution and length of some of the sentence patterns of formulaic expressions. Furthermore, with reference to the classification of difficulty for each speech act, significant differences were identified between the participants. Nevertheless, the learners stated that pragmatic instruction enhanced their communication skills, facilitated their pragmatic awareness on intercultural differences, as well as infused confidence in English interactions. Although the examined studies included a handful of participants who believed that instruction was not very helpful, all four studies suggest that pragmatic instruction is essentially crucial and supportive for L2 learners to communicate more successfully.
2.4. Conclusion:
In summary, instruction in pragmatics is important to foster well-balanced communicators who can achieve their communicative goals with confidence and flexibility in a globalised world where English is the international language of communication. The Noticing Hypothesis (1993,1995, 2001) plays as an important role in the development of pragmatic competence as it is purported to do for other aspects of language. Moving on to deal with the research methodology and the research design is the next step in our journey of exploration. The following chapter aims at outlining the research design, sampling techniques, data collection procedures and measures, the analyses taxonomy and the coding plans. Furthermore, validity issues will be addressed.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0. Introduction:
At the heart of any research process is humans’ unsparing curiosity to better understand and solve problems in the world at large, and particularly in the surrounding environment. Perry (2005: 8) defines research as “the process whereby questions are raised and answers are sought by carefully gathering, analysing, and interpreting data.” Therefore, on seeking the truth of a phenomenon, one has to pursue answers via scientific procedures rather than simply following one’s intuitions. Seliger and Shohamy (2013) suggest that in one’s search to answer certain questions and resolve particular research queries, we use observation, questioning, experimentation, and elicitation, scientific procedures. Afterwards, data are collected and analysed; hypotheses are formed, tested, and evaluated. Then, reliable conclusions that can stand verification based on evidence are drawn. Scientific research is a disciplined inquiry that is conducted systematically to reach conclusions to certain questions. Notably, it is the means with which one can reach consistent and sound conclusions.

In the same vein, this research process is informed by contemporary research on learning and teaching English as a foreign/second language (TEFL) (TESL). Loaded with inherent conflicts that go beyond refuting, research on TEFL or TESL is said to be based on elusive, and contradictory assumptions about the very nature of reality and existence (Myles, 2013: 70). These vague assumptions, though meant to resolve conflicts, tend to aggravate them. This results in ongoing clashes, five of which are most relevant to this study, namely the dilemma between the individual versus the
society; language as a system versus language in use; competence versus performance; acquisition versus learning; and focus on forms versus focus on meaning (Kurtz, 2014).

To further understand L2 phenomena, Perry (2005), sustained and echoed by Seliger and Shohamy (2013), points out that there is a bipolar continuum that outlines research, in which research ranges from theoretical (basic) to applied (practical). Regarding the theoretical aspect of this study, it is well founded on frameworks of SLA and pragmatics in which learners acquire knowledge pragmatic knowledge and language learning strategies in learning pragmatics of L2 language. However, it particularly attempts to explore and solve real-world educational problems in the field of foreign language learning and education. It does primarily not deal with abstract constructs and it does not aim to test theories, it rather addresses prompt and practical ways to improve the learners’ acquisition of the TL. That is why this study is claimed to be well-adjusted away from the basic end of the continuum. The current study is classified as more of an applied research, for its application of a specific cognitive hypothesis about L2 learning, Schmidt’s Noticing Hypothesis (1993, 1995, 2001). It is considered a real-world employment of the theoretical and the applied findings in language teaching methodologies with some practical implications for language classrooms and materials. Clearly, this research is situated in the nexus of two-fold distinction suggested by Perry (2005), the theoretical and the applied. In an attempt to bridge the chasm between research and practice, this research adopts action research as a methodology. Somekh (1995) and Denscombe (2010) claim action research
bonds research and practice together. It brings about practical improvement, innovation, change or development of social practice; it gives practitioners better understanding of their practices in aspiration of altering such problems bringing about viable solutions. Denscombe (2010) contends action research to be basically practical and applied, a research that is set out to work out real-world problems. In the light of these categories, this study identifies itself with Perry's (2005: 3) definition that, “applied linguistics is concerned with practical issues involving language in the life of the community. The most important of these is the learning of second or foreign languages.”

The current study endeavours to probe deeply into one of the modern problems in the field of applied linguistics and foreign language acquisition, namely, the role of pragmatic instruction to empower foreign language learners with a firm grasp of the functional aspect of the language they have been grappling with. Utilising an empirical approach, it attempts to find out more about the well-founded basis behind acquiring and learning the functional aspect of the foreign language. Deeply seated in the nexus of social SLA together with the socio-cognitive psychology approaches to foreign language learning and teaching, this study places strong emphasis on the human being as a mental self and a social being, where the cognitive orientation is informed by social concerns. It assumes the role of awareness as a central aspect in learning, where cognitive consciousness affects intake and learning.
The current study is an exploratory action research which aims at exploring the undergraduate English learners’ pragmatic learning and abilities in EFL contexts in Egypt. With a paucity of research in this realm, pragmatic competence and abilities particularly in the foreign language learning context of Egypt, this research explores new prospects in pragmatic instruction and awareness. According to Mitchell and Myles (2004) and Mitchell et al. (2013), this study highlights different language aspects such as the role and quality of linguistic input in instruction and learning as well as the optimal conditions for the production of TL output in pedagogical interaction. With special interest in language pedagogy, theories in language as well as in pedagogy cannot be overlooked since they are all intricately related and intertwined. This study focuses on adopting a critical pedagogical approach, which involves dealing with the different cultural and social issues that pose challenges to the learners rather than only the classroom issues that the teacher has to handle.

3.1. The Research Paradigm:
Based on the theoretical framework presented in Chapter 2, this chapter presents the research methodology of the study. The research paradigm of this study is based on the four cardinal elements of the process of research described by Crotty (1998, 2003). Correspondingly, Cohen, L., Manion and Morrison, (2013) as well as Scotland (2012) discuss the research process along the same lines as Crotty. He (2003) attests the first element is the ontology, the assumptions about how the reality of the world is constructed, and the nature of reality. The second element is the epistemology, the beliefs about how to reveal knowledge and understanding about the world, the philosophical underpinnings which inform the choice of the employed methodology.
The third element comprises of the methodological considerations involving the overall research design and the research questions to be addressed. Finally, the fourth element involves the methods employed as well as the data collection and analysis procedures adopted to explore and answer these research questions (see figure 2).

![Figure 2: Elements of the Framework of the Study](image)

![Figure 3: Research Paradigm and Process](image)

### 3.1.1. Ontology and Epistemology:
The ontological assumption about the nature of this study draws on is a mix of both relativist as well as the realist perspectives (see figure 2), which aims at sensitising humans with hidden social forces and their configurations. Particularly, this study employs qualitative methods, which draw inferences about reality rather than fixing it,
using social constructionist assumptions. For more than three decades, many researchers including Suppe (1977), Baert (1998) and Hammersley (1998; 2002; 2007) as well as Sayer (2000) claim that social science has been dominated by realism as the philosophical approach it draws on. Ormston et al. (2013: 4-5) highlight realism as an ontological position that hinges on the notion that “there is an external reality which exists independently of people’s beliefs about or understanding of it”.

On the other hand, relativists, according to Block (1996: 69), look for tendencies, “working hypotheses…time-and-place bound knowledge”. Gregg (2000: 384, cited in Doman, 2005:132) emphasises the multiplicity of perspectives in relativism, this view “allows for multiple theories to ‘bloom’ and flourish”. Essentially, this study identifies itself with Howson’s (2009: 2) view of cultural relativism in which ‘respect for difference’ is key concept. This perspective underlines cultural context, which is “critical to an understanding of people’s values, beliefs and practices” according to Howson (2009: 1). Schmidt (2001: 138) suggests “all truths are socially conditioned and value laden”. To conclude, the incorporation of a mix both the realist and cultural relativist approaches is maintained throughout, precisely with a cognitive-sociocultural perspective. Therefore, this study attempts to elucidate meaning inductively and it embraces more of a subjective ontology.

Adhering to a view of language and its acquisition as a social phenomenon that is interactively constructed in both the head and the world, this study emphasises the importance of language use in real-world situations to learning. DeKeyser and Juffs
(2005: 437) assume “Nobody would doubt that language, whether first or second, is an aspect of human cognition”. Conspicuously, reality is a product of human cognitive processes. Moreover, Long and Doughty (2003: 869) believe in the dominance of the cognitive orientation to SLA, “the logical choice for the field”.

However, Firth and Wagner (1997: 290) argue that language is a “social and negotiable product of interaction”, where language learners are participants in these “social interaction[s]” (Firth & Wagner, 1997: 286). Sharwood Smith (1991) describes the “cake” of SLA to be cognitive, while the “icing” of this cake is the social (cited in Zuengler & Miller, 2006: 36). In keeping with Smith’s belief, Larsen-Freeman (2002: 34) views language learning and acquisition as a process that involves a blend of the cognitive and the social elements in which “the process itself is cognitive yet the social context shapes it”. Cohen, A. and Shively (2007) emphasise the critical role of the perspective of the participating individuals in determining the social world around them where hidden social forces and configurations are brought to attention. Notably, this study adopts more of a socio-cognitive approach to SLA (Atkinson, 2002) rather than a pure cognitive or a pure social approach.

More of an ‘Interpretivism’ is in turn the epistemological underpinning this research holds to, a quintessential model for social research where reality is out there but it is rather complex (see figure 3). According to Crotty (1998), meaning is socially constructed through interaction between our consciousness and the world. This research is firmly entrenched in interpretivism, a philosophical orientation that is non-
extremist. Informed by interpretivism, language and language learning problems should be perceived and addressed giving more room for contextual factors (Schuh & Barab, 2007). Therefore, it can be construed that there are as many realities as individuals, whilst meaning may be constructed diversely based on the variety of people who constructed it.

Accepting ideologies rather than questioning them, the interpretive paradigm this study assumes co-constructs meaningful reality in and out of interaction. This interaction is between individuals and their world in a social context, their pragmatic competence in the foreign language and their attitudes towards this experience, where knowledge that is ‘culturally derived’ and ‘historically situated’ is sought (Pring, 2000: 251). Furthermore, the materials used for the intervention in this study involve interpreting conversation cues and illocutionary force, in which meaning would be co-created via interpretations and inferences. Consequently, the ‘hidden social rules’ of the language, the pragmatic rules governing their use would be easily induced.

Social constructionism is the theoretical perspective this research is grounded in (see figure 3). According to Crotty (1998: 8-9), social constructionism is anchored on truth or meaning that “comes into existence in and out of our engagement with realities in our world…meaning [that] is not discovered, but constructed” rather than being passively received. In more recent work, Crotty (2003: 42-43) emphasises, “meaning is not simply found, it is actively constructed by human beings through their consciousness as they engage with the world”. He further signifies that interpretations and meaning are
not made up from simply getting engaged with the object; in fact, our social, historical
and culture awareness play an important role in the construction of meaning (Crotty,
2003: 52-53). Clearly, we are influenced by our social and physical realities besides the
cumulated knowledge of the past amounting to our present knowledge, i.e. our prior
knowledge along with our cultural pre-existing system of rules, which constrain our
behaviour and direct our experience.

Social constructionism developed with social pragmatists like Charles Sanders Peirce,
a key American academic (1839-1914), who was both ‘constructionist’ and ‘critical’.
Pragmatics, the focus of this research is the study of ‘meaning-making’. According to
many scholars, including but not limited to Leech (1983); Levinson (1983); Mey (2001);
and Thomas (2006) making meaning and individuals’ use of language hinge on specific
psycho-sociological factors such as, power, distance, imposition, and affect to arrive at
particular interpretation out of the many competing ones. Hence, it is at the nexus of
pragmatics and the world that individuals have to construct meaning based on these
psycho-sociological aspects, elements of the world. This is where this study and the
constructional assumption as an epistemological stance come into accord.

Sharing the concept of the criticality of language to philosophical concerns, many
classical analytic philosophers, amongst whom is John Searle, known as the godfather
of pragmatics, believes that common sense as well as the results of modern science
should be invariably respected. Breaking away with analytic philosophers, Searle was
engaged in the attempt to build the Grand Philosophical Theory, which attempts to
come to grips with the facts of language. Motivated by language philosophers such as Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) (as cited in Suh, 2012: 206) “who held that what humans do with language involves doing verbal acts for communication, and captures the nature of everyday interaction”, a lot of researchers were encouraged to examine the learners’ abilities to express various social functions in different situations mainly via speech acts. Given the notable differences between NSs and NNSs in the performance of speech acts, and assuming benefits of the teachability of L2 pragmatics, the effectiveness of pragmatic instruction on the learning of pragmatic knowledge were critically examined. Alcón-Soler and Martínez-Flor (2008: 4) highlight “there is evidence indicating that pragmatics is teachable and that pedagogical intervention has a facilitative role in learning pragmatics in foreign language contexts”.

As previously mentioned, this tenet was shared by many researchers including Crandall and Basturkmen (2004), Rose (2005), Takahashi (2010a, 2010b), and Taguchi (2015). Mahani (2012: 44) further stresses “regardless of the length of the instructional period, learners receiving pragmatic instruction outperformed those who did not”.

The present study focuses on the effectiveness of instruction, which targets pragmatic features that would influence EFL learners’ use and interaction in real contexts. It aims at securing the learners’ successful communication without minimal communication breakdowns. Hymes (1971) argues the critical role of language use against Chomsky’s narrow view of linguistic competence, which made for the rise of CC (see Chapter 1). Suh (2012) claims CC comes to the foreground in both research and pedagogy within
the field of SLA. Hinkel (2006) underscores the appropriateness of form and meaning in language use, i.e. pragmatic competence, a key component to CC in which social, cultural, and functional aspects of language were brought to attention in L2 learning and teaching. Brown (2007) maintains pragmatic competence should become the ultimate goal of L2 learning being an essential aspect for successful communication because it has many implications for the development of learners’ CC. Rose (2005: 386) points out “second language learners who do not receive instruction in pragmatics differ significantly from native speakers in their pragmatic production and perception in the target language”. Particularly, Morón, Cruz, Amaya and Lopez (2009) echo both Bardovi-Harlig (2001) and Rose (2005), who argue the significance of both the cultural and contextual aspects of language, which cannot be overlooked by the instructor. Learning the functional features of the L2 is believed to be of pivotal importance in order to enable L2 learners to come to grips with the truth of L2 knowledge and to become able to solve problems in response to the world’s rapid change working out failures of previous language teaching/learning models.

3.1.2. Methodological Considerations and Methods:
A growing interest in the application of scientific methods to the study of social and educational problems’, (Wallace, 1987, cited in Carr, 2006: 422) made for the rise of action research. According to Kurt Lewin (1948), the founder of action research, it is not merely to understand and interpret the world but in fact to change it (Adelman, 1993). On dealing with the limitations of traditional practices to teaching foreign language, educational problems, action research can be one of the powerful methodological tools. According to Somekh (2006: 1, cited in Carr, 2006: 421), it is engaged in overcoming
these shortcomings in an aspiration for change and development. Furthermore, Koshy (2005: 3) contends that “[action research] creates new knowledge based on enquiries conducted within specific and often practical contexts”. Quintessential to critical research, according to Scotland (2012: 6), while having an agenda to change the status quo in foreign language learning and teaching with reference to its functional aspect, this study employs action research as a research methodology that should bring about change and accomplish this determination. It aims to sustain the growth and development of all participating parties.

Using systematic critical self-inquiry, a key point that Bassey (1999: 39, cited in Costello, 2011: 5) highlights in his definition of action research is as in: “[it is] an enquiry, which is carried out to understand, to evaluate, and to change, in order to improve some educational practices”. Correspondingly, Frost (2002: 25, cited in Costello, 2011: 5) defines action research as “a process of systematic reflection, enquiry, and action carried out by individuals about their own profession practices”. Hence, self-reflection and the involvement of both the researcher and the participants as active contributors in an evolving process are key issues that are brought to attention (the learners’ self-reported diaries & the researcher’s field notes).

With this new perspective of the researcher as a participant, O’Leary, Z. (2014: 166-167) states “action research also offered a departure from the notion of ‘researcher’ as expert and the ‘researched’ as passive recipients of scientific knowledge”. To situate this research in a more particular stance, this study adopts a personal attempt of a
practitioner in the field of education at not only understanding, critically evaluating and improving some practices in the field of profession, but also to change them, according to Reason and Torbert (2001). Basically, it contributes to the betterment of knowledge in education action, informing judgments and decisions in practices in education for a change in general and particularly in foreign language education assuming the role of the researcher as an active agent of change. This study employs the participatory teacher-researcher who is actively involved in all steps of the process, planning, administering, observing, writing reflective logs, evaluating outcomes, and intervening to refine process. The partnership nature of this research tends to be illustrated in the shared efforts, activities, and above all the ownership of all attributes of the research including its planning, responsibility, made decisions, the gathered data, and so on.

Action research was selected as the preferred research method for several reasons, one of which is that it facilitates problem solving, which is according to Powell (2001: 884, cited in Anderson, 2013), a ‘mandate of science’ rather than finding realities and truths in the world. This research attempts to solve “specific problems within a programme, organisation, or community”, according to Patton (1990: 157) and Denscombe (2010) (EFL context in Egypt). It targets pragmatic competence and development “specific classroom problems for the purpose of curriculum renewal and/or professional development” according to Field (1997: 192) and Denscombe (2010). Undertaking action research as the methodology of the present study aims at bringing about change in specific contexts via generating and implementing solutions to practical problems, which in turn would empower practitioners (McNiff, 2013; Meyer,
Denscombe (2010: 126) states action research is “set out to alter things…an afterthought which follows the conclusion of the research”. It is further emphasised that monitoring and reflecting on the process and its possible outcomes of change should be done thoroughly and critically.

According to Reeves (2000: 8), conducting a rigorous and reflective investigation to examine and refine learning environments should provide solutions to complex problems, particularly in the field of education and the L2 educational system. Along the same lines, Denscombe (2010: 126) emphasises the ‘feedback loop’ effect, which opens possibilities of the implementation of change, an evaluation of its impact, in a cyclical process. This empirical study is interventional and it aims at creating an impact on both the educational research and system. In spite of the fact that it is conducted in a contrived context, a classroom rather than a natural setting, it places high emphasis on the partnership between the practitioners and the researcher in the field of education, being among these practitioners. It also allows for the ‘feedback loop effect’ in which change is sought for improvement based on the continuous dialogue among the involved parties, the learners and the researcher. For instance, role-plays were conducted in groups rather than in individual pairs in front of all of the participants in the classroom, to alleviate public performance fear and to boost learners’ self-confidence while being engaged in communicative activities.

Pursuing insights and understandings of behaviour, i.e. investigating interaction, in order to explain the phenomenon at hand and solve problems from the participants’ perspectives without directing these participants, self-reported diaries were selected
and employed. The participants’ voice was explored focusing on their opinions, feelings, experiences and inner thoughts about their own language learning experience. Typical of self-reported diaries, qualitative data were generated to support or refute the other findings of study that were elicited from the other two instruments, namely the Multiple Choice Discourse Completion Task (MDCT) and the Written Discourse Completion Task (WDCT). These data offered justifiable accounts and rich data managed by the participants themselves without any interference. Nevertheless, the analyses of these diaries were personal interpretations and thus the value-system is made explicitly clear from the very beginning in the coming section (Appendix C) to avoid subjectivity and ensure that the research process can be replicated in a different context and subject to professional scrutiny and critique.

Action research is no exception to other research methodologies; it has its own limitations, which need to be counteracted and reduced. Somekh (1995: 11) identifies ‘a range of methodological issues that are problematic for action researchers’. At the forefront of these issues is “the nature of human action, the status and validity of the knowledge produced through action research” (Carr, 2006: 421). Using triangulation of methods with mix of results that substantiated each other is believed to cater for this caveat. Besides, the findings of this research are not meant to be generalizable except under similar circumstances; in fact, they raise flags to certain issues in foreign language classrooms.
Not only action research, but also a mixed methods approach was employed as one of the research methods this study adopts to answer the research questions. The yielded data are critically analysed and evaluated utilising a systematic and validated method. This is followed by an action to improve this practice, alongside of which there is some continuous self-reflection, over a particular period of time, a 10-week time period. To validate and strengthen the interpretation of the collected data, triangulation is attempted by using two types of questionnaires as well as self-reported diaries to avoid single occasion bias and to reveal underlying structures. Utilising data that are both numerical (statistical) and textual (verbal/linguistic) in order to explore the social world via focusing on ‘meanings’, they produce information-rich descriptions and ‘understandings’ of social life to reveal the underlying meaning of events and activities. There is much to be gained from a fusion of the two research traditions: the triangulation of both numerical and textual data, to validate each other for the improvement of practice. Integrating theory with practice, the theory evolves and becomes refined as the data unfold, where the research process is informed by the gathered data as well as the theoretical underpinnings.

Engrained in applied linguistics as well as SLA, the design of action research embraces multiple methods to amplify the instance under investigation. To illustrate this point, it employs a mixed model of qualitative-quantitative research tradition. The acquisition of L2 pragmatic competence, using mixed methods, as in the two types of DCT questionnaires as well as the self-reported diaries, were utilised to avoid extreme “relativism, [the study’s ontological position], to the point of rejecting the ideas of
hypothesis testing and falsification of theories” according to DeKeyser (2014: 361). He claims conjoining pure qualitative research with sociocultural work makes any research inadequate from the point of view of the philosophy of science because it does not allow for hypothesis testing.

Another procedure that was employed to control any drawback of the selected methodology was to divide the intervention into two cycles. Due to the fact that the timeframe limits the possibility of reiteration, the intervention has been divided into two cycles. Hence, in this study the second cycle counts as a reiteration. Once the first cycle has been completed there would be evaluation to inform some formal decision for modification if necessary. Using my field notes, adjustments were considered for improvement in the second cycle of the intervention. With reference to Shavelson et al. (2003) the research design of such a paradigm is iterative, multileveled, theory-driven and generative. This investigation was reiterated in two cycles; each cycle took five weeks of the total of 10-week intervention. In the second cycle, pedagogical modifications were made based on discourse among participants including the researcher, reflections and the findings of the first cycle. It is multi-levelled because it explores the learners’ perception on one stage, their production on another level, and their voice and attitudes on a further one. Described by Dick (2002, cited in Costello, 2011: 5) as being ‘cyclic’, action research uses research, critical evaluation and reflection in turn, followed by a review of the previous action and a plan for the next cycle. This study employs a similar approach where investigations are made to attain
deeper understanding and knowledge of the current status of the educational action (practice).

3.2. Design of the study:
Informed by Bardovi-Harlig et al. (1991) as well as Kasper and Rose (2002), Rose (2005), Jeon and Kaya’s (2006) meta-analysis; Ishihara and Cohen, A. (2014), and Hua Tan and Farashaiyan (2015) among others instructional intervention is believed to have a facilitative role in developing L2 learners’ pragmatic competence. Based on empirical evidence, this study is designed to explore the role of pragmatics instruction on EFL learners’ perception and production of requests as well as exploring the learners’ attitudes towards their learning the functional features of the TL. It utilises awareness raising techniques as well as a blend of explicit and implicit teaching methodologies as the instructional approach. It aims at having direct application to instructional decisions, a resource to inform teaching practice. In their review of the research to date, Alcón-Soler and Martínez-Flor (2008) note evidence for the benefits of both types of instructions. Other researchers such as Norris and Ortega (2000), Koike and Pearson (2005), Gu (2011) among other experimental studies advocate the benefits on the learners’ pragmatic development. They suggest giving explicit metapragmatic information and visually enhancing a particular structure in the input during language learning activities (Sharwood Smith, 1991), i.e. implicit instruction, where there is ‘focus on form’, meaning is achieved in processing pragmatics (Long & Richards, 1998; Long, 1991: 45-46). Therefore, the current study contributes to the available body of research of pragmatic competence development and acquisition where learners are empowered by experiencing and experimenting with the language
‘at a deeper level’. Learners are encouraged to participate in ‘the purpose of language communication’ as Bardovi-Harlig et al. (1991:13-14) call it. Eslami-Rasekh et al. (2004) argue the positive effect of explicit metapragmatic teaching on comprehension of speech acts where EFL learners’ pragmatic comprehension of the speech acts improved following the instruction.

The framework of this research embraces four basic parameters of research; accordingly, the present study addressed the following research questions:

Table 3.1: The Research Paradigm of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Data analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research question 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent will instruction in pragmatics affect the learners' ability to</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Data are statistically analysed in an attempt to identify the participants'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make judgments about the appropriateness of requests?</td>
<td>MDCT</td>
<td>judgments of the most appropriate rejoinder request for ten different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>questionnaires</td>
<td>situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Appendix A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research question 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) To what extent will instruction in pragmatics affect the learners'</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Data are examined qualitatively based upon the utilised lexical and syntactic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance of target-like requests that are pragmalinguistically appropriate?</td>
<td>WDCT</td>
<td>devices using the Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) typology of modification for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Appendix B)</td>
<td>request as a speech act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) To what extent will the instruction in pragmatics affect the learners'</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Data are examined qualitatively based upon the utilised requestive strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance of target-like production of requests that are sociopragmatically</td>
<td>WDCT</td>
<td>and the modifiers using the Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) typology of modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriate?</td>
<td>(Appendix B)</td>
<td>for request as a speech act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research question 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What are the learners' attitudes towards the target language learning experience</td>
<td>Self- reported</td>
<td>Data are qualitatively analysed which are the data induced from the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after the pragmatic instructional intervention?</td>
<td>diaries</td>
<td>participants’ logs of diaries aiming at identifying the participants’ voice,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Appendix C)</td>
<td>patterns, and attitudes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As previously mentioned, a mix of qualitative-quantitative design was adopted bringing together a combination of quantitative and qualitative data. Drawing on reviews regarding the use of mixed approach, it is believed that a triangulation of qualitative and quantitative approach is better than one approach in thorough exploration of the learners’ perception, production of pragmatic competence as well as the strategies
adopted to realise speech acts appropriately (Denscombe, 2010). According to Sandelowski (2003, cited in Yuan, 2012:101), this research design is expected to achieve a fuller understanding of the phenomenon under investigation and improve the validity of the research. According to Denscombe (2010: 139) using triangulation is expected to improve confidence in the accuracy of the findings, provide a more complete picture, and compensate strengths as well as weaknesses. Informed by L2 acquisition research and theory, particularly the theoretical framework in pragmatics and applied linguistics, this design is thought to be suitable for purpose of this study. Regarding the application of this multi-method approach to this study, a wider range of knowledge is expected concerning the participants’ perception of pragmatic appropriateness of speech act realisation strategies. Furthermore, it allows for more information about the participants’ production of a particular speech act, as well as their attitudes towards their pragmatic performance and their learning experience.

The aforementioned combination of quantitative and qualitative data was generated as in the former set of data from the participants’ contribution in the recognition MDCT questionnaires. The MDCTs returns were statistically analysed in an attempt to identify the participants’ judgments of the most appropriate rejoinder request for ten different situations. Tables were used to show the distribution and the occurrence rate of the variables across the sample, which were used to conduct a comparative analysis within and across the sampled participants pre-and-post intervention. The latter set of data was induced from the data generated via the participants’ contribution in two instruments: the production WDCTs as well as the self-reported diaries. The WDCTs
were examined based upon the utilised lexical and syntactic devices, the requestive strategies and the modifiers that underpin the analysis of the acquisition of requests. The participants’ request rejoinder was linguistically analysed using the Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) typology of modification for request as a speech act (see Appendix B). There was another set of qualitative data that was verbally analysed which were the data induced from the participants’ logs of diaries aiming at identifying the participants’ voice, patterns, and attitudes (see Appendix C). This taken into consideration scholars such as Eslami-Rasekh (2005: 207) who emphasises “second language learners may want to actively create both a new interlanguage and an accompanying identity in the learning process.”

3.3. Sampling:
The participants in this study were 50 Egyptian EFL students (2 intact classes) in their first year from the Department of Humanities at the College of Language and Communication (CLC), a college in one of the renowned and multicultural private universities in Cairo, Egypt. All of the participants share basic demographic features, such as their field of the study, their main subject of study, and their first language (native speakers of Arabic) except for one participant who is native speaker of English. She is an American who voluntarily participated in this study to give her insights about learning L2 in ESL contexts. For her, it was learning Arabic as a second language. The participants’ ages range between 18 and 21, and there are both males and females among them. Their English linguistic competence was evaluated as intermediate, equivalent to *B1-B2* (Independent user) according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) (Council of Europe, 2011) based on a
placement test administered, prior to the research as an admission requirement by the university for placement purposes. According to the score comparison tool of the English Testing System (ETS) organisation, their scores should be equivalent to 53-93 on the Internet-Based TOEFL test (IBT) and band 4.5 - band 6 on the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) test. Thus they would be typical of most of the intermediate EFL learners who have studied English from 6 to 10 years, mainly at school. As for their experience in living in countries where English was spoken as a native language, almost none had had any experience of more than a month. This convenience sample seemed most appropriate for the present study as random assignment of participant was not possible because the groups used in the study were intact classes administratively defined in terms of levels, language proficiency, and teachers.

3.3.1. Rationale for Selecting Participants:
For the present study, the selected sample is well stratified with respect to the target population (intermediate proficiency Egyptian foreign language learners). It represents a variety of backgrounds and thus they share a lot of features with the target population, such as their control exposure to the TL, their gender, and their common background. The selected sample is aimed to be representative of the population of interest and that reached results might be generalizable in certain respects for populations with similar characteristics and under similar circumstances.

These participants seemed appropriate for the study for three reasons: first, they represented one first language background, and they were similar in their socio-
economic background. Moreover, the difference in their language proficiency was insignificant since they all sat for the same English placement test, and they all scored **B1-B2** level or intermediate level (Independent user). Being independent users of the language, the linguistic level of the participants seemed ideal for this study, because their English proficiency is high enough to participate in this study. In fact, these participants are enrolled to study either Language and Translation or Media as their main field of studies in the CLC and thus they are able to deal with the instruments in the study. In addition, their linguistic competence may include certain pragmalinguistic failures because they still need further time to attain pragmatic competence. Furthermore, this intermediate level of grammatical competence would be a satisfactory level for the participants to fully comprehend the instrument, the MDCT and the WDCT. Both groups were classes in the CLC enrolled in Listening course, which focuses on the language skills of listening and speaking, an appropriate environment to introduce the intervention. According to Economidou-Kogetsidis (2008: 22), most studies focusing on FL learners’ request production have concentrated on learners at advanced levels rather than intermediate-lower level learners; this study aims to make a contribution to the still fairly under researched area of intermediate level FL learners’ request performance.

### 3.4. Instruments of Data Collection:
Determining the methods to employ to collect data has posed significant dilemma to many scholars in the field of pragmatics including Kasper and Roever (2005), Alcón-Soler and Martínez-Flor (2008), Nurani (2009), Félix-Brasdefer (2010), and particularly Martínez-Flor and Usó-Juan (2011). Two of the foremost dilemmas they identified are
the validity of the data and “[their] adequacy to approximate the authentic performance of linguistic action”, Kasper and Dahl (1991: 215). When for the first time employed by Blum-Kulka (1982) to examine pragmatic speech acts, the Discourse Completion Tasks (DCTs) have become one of the most commonly used research instruments in pragmatic research (Halupka-Rešetar, 2014; Félix-Brasdefer, 2010; Roever, 2009; Cohen, A., 2004; Kasper & Rose, 2002; Kasper, 2000).

This research takes a multi-method approach, in line with Kasper and Rose (2002) as well as Cohen, A. (2004), and Félix-Brasdefer (2010): two sets of data were collected via the elicitation procedure known as the W/MDCT. The former set of data was collected before the intervention whereas the latter was gathered after the intervention, from the evaluation tasks, respectively. The data of the first set were compiled using two kinds of DCTs: a perception/recognition multiple-choice discourse completion task (MDCT) and a production one, the open-ended written discourse completion task, (WDCT). The second set of data was generated using the same instruments (W/MDCTs) besides the participants’ self-reported diaries.

The learners’ recognition and production of pragmatic information and whether they interacted according to contextual cues of the setting were of paramount importance, on examining the role of pedagogical instruction in pragmatic aspects in EFL contexts resulting in a clearer picture of their pragmatic competence. Accordingly, some interactional data were elicited under control conditions where the setting of the interaction and the variables intervening in them were controlled. For example, the
recognition MDCTs served to measure recognition and interpretation of utterances to evaluate the participants’ perceptions of pragmatic appropriateness of speech act realisation strategies. Similarly, in the production WDCTs, pragmatic production of speech act strategies was elicited. Alongside these W/MDCTs, self-reported diaries were employed to obtain information on the learners’ affect, behaviour, and cognitive processes, attitudes regarding their pragmatic performance.

3.4.1. Instrument: Pre-and-Post Intervention Tasks (Questionnaires) DCT:
Due to the large sample size, a modified version of both the recognition MDCT and the production WDCT were used to elicit the speech act of request from almost two thirds of the two datasets. The recognition MDCT is a questionnaire containing a set of briefly described real-life situations designed to elicit judgments on the pragmatic appropriateness of requests employed. The production WDCT is a questionnaire containing a set of briefly described situations followed by a space in which the respondents were required to produce a response. It is designed to elicit a particular speech act, request from NNSs by responding in writing to the given prompts.

3.4.2. Discourse Completion Tasks (DCT) Design:
As mentioned earlier, this study uses two instruments to collect the required data, one of which would be the W/MDCT questionnaires alongside the self-reported diary. The former was administered twice: pre-and post-intervention, whereas the diary was kept during the period of the intervention only. Each DCT was broken down to almost ten scenarios representing socially differentiated situations. Based on the previous research (Kasper & Rose, 2002: 95-96 and Blum-Kulka et al., 1989) among other
researchers in more recent works such as Martínez-Flor and Usó-Juan (2011), it was expected that this number of items would be sufficient for the purpose of the present study. The range of the speech events varied denoting different situations that the respondents may encounter in their real-life situations. Besides, to avoid boredom and losing the participants’ attention, the number of items or situations was limited to ten to avoid weariness and poor rate of returns (Denscombe, 2010). It was meant to be quick to complete and easy to follow, yet, it provided rich feedback of the participants’ processing.

The situational description in both W/MDCTs was given in English. It is based on the family, social and academic lives of people in an English-speaking culture. The situations are student-life orientated in order to reflect occidental learners’ real life experience and to ensure as much as possible the naturalness of data. The situations represent variable social power, social distance and size of imposition between interlocutors. Both W/MDCTs were designed to explore the role of instruction on the pragmatic aspects on the ILP competence of intermediate proficiency EFL learners. Ultimately, each participant had two scores on the recognition/perception MDCT: one on the pre-intervention evaluation task and the other on the post-intervention MDCT; two contributions to the production WDCT; and at least four entries in their self-reported diaries.

After designing the questionnaires, the W/MDCTs, they had been piloted twice: once to almost ten native speakers from the United Kingdom, the United States, and Australia.
The second time, the two W/MDCTs were piloted to two intact groups that were taken from the same population that the participants were drawn from in the main study. These pilot-groups were not the ones that would be used in the main study. The W/MDCTs were sent via email and follow-up discussions were conducted via Skype. Comments and suggestions for amendments had been taken into consideration and were implemented. Thus, questionnaires were reviewed based on NSs’ intuitions and the W/MDCTs were ready for use. Participants were asked to respond to each scenario by their choice of the most appropriate request based on the context of scenario, situation, in the recognition MDCT. They were also required to provide their projected responses or how they responded in writing, if any, in the production WDCT in each situation as a request (Trosborg, 1995).

3.4.2.1. Recognition Multiple Discourse Completion Task (MDCT): Recognition/Perception MDCT is closed in format and contains ten items, each of which offers a hypothetical situation where a request is employed. The learners were required to select the best response among three options that are available as possible rejoinders to the situation. In fact, there is the most appropriate answer, which is a pragmalinguistically and sociopragmatically appropriate response and there are two other distracters, which are either inappropriate or inaccurate. The distractors were crafted so that one is violating the socio-pragmatic features and the other is violating the pragmalinguistic features of the context in a random order. This resulted in one option that is socially appropriate but linguistically incorrect, and one that is socially inappropriate but linguistically correct. These distractors provided negative evidence of what is inappropriate in the TL. It is expected that this negative evidence would impact
positively on the learners’ L2 acquisition where learners are given a chance to attend to linguistic forms. Echoing Sheen (2004), Kang (2010: 582) argues that negative evidence, “language information about what is not possible in the target language” is believed to play a facilitative role in L2 acquisition. The learners were required to make their evaluation on the requests employed in these situations, whether they are appropriate. Most of the items used in the perception MDCT were adapted from different sources namely Parent (2002), Julie (1995), and Montserrat (1993) (see Appendix A). The situations were designed based on the three social parameters: P, SD, and SI. The parameters were limited to dichotomous variables (+/- P, +/-SD, +/-SI). All situations are of equal weight and complexity to ensure that the respondents are not faced with the most complex situations at the start which is likely to deter them to proceed. Besides, the order of the situations was consigned randomly to ensure that the respondents’ responses are not affected.

3.4.2.2. Production WDCT:
Production WDCT is a type of instrument that provides learners with a detailed description of a situation they are required to respond to. Specifically, it is a simulation of a communicative encounter “that elicits spoken data in which two interlocutors assume roles under predefined experimental conditions” (Félix-Brasdefer, 2010: 47). It is an open-ended written task (WDCT). The questionnaire involves eight written prompts (brief descriptions of real-life situations) followed by an empty space in which the respondents were required to make an appropriate request expression in order to achieve their aim fulfilled without offending their interlocutor based on the proposed situations. The given space is expected to be unrestricted to the length of the
informants’ responses, i.e. sufficient for them to express their aims and state their requests. This was evaluated during the piloting of the DCTs. Similar to the MDCT, the complexity, the weight, and the order of the situations employed in the WDCT were considered carefully so that the respondents are not deterred from participating and that their contributions are not affected by any anomaly in these aspects.

These situations were designed to elicit a particular pragmatic aspect under investigation, namely, requests. The eight real-life situations involve sociopragmatic variables of social power, size or degree of imposition, and social distance, which are intertwined. The first variable concerns the power of the requester over the requestee whether there is more power, medium to low power. The second variable involves the size of imposition, which refers to the weight or degree of difficulty in the situation, whether asking for a small favour or a big one. The third social factor is the social distance, generally assumed to affect the politeness of an utterance, and it refers to the degree of familiarity between the interlocutors. It focuses on the familiarity of the interlocutors, high social distance, medium to low social distance. (see appendix B for the WDCT).

3.4.2.3. Rationale for Using DCT:
DCT as an instrument for investigation was first developed to study lexical simplification by Levinson and Blum-Kula (1978), and later, Blum-Kulka (1982) adapted it to examine speech act. Ahn (2005) offers it together with five other measures of cross-cultural pragmatics, whether the Open Discourse Completion Task or the Multiple-choice Discourse Completion Task. Since then, justified criticism has been levelled at DCT, as a procedure of data collection. It was claimed that some of its situations may oblige the
respondents to play unfamiliar roles which urges them to create unnatural utterances. They were criticised for being labelled as limiting the capture of the authentic communication because of the space it provides which may be restrictive to the length of the informant’s response (Rose, 1992). Golato (2003) among other opponents of WDCT such as Rose (1994), Rose and Ono (1995), Hinkel (1996) argue that it does not seem to reflect the gamut of strategies used in speech acts employed in oral performance. To illustrate, learners use hesitations, repetitions, inversions, and longer supportive moves, and the interactional facets which are absent in the WDCT. Moreover, Rose (1994) emphasises that it presents a short written segment rather than real-life extract. This was concurred by Sasaki (1998) who added that DCT appears in a test-like method where informants are required to respond in a written mode of what they would say orally, implying that their rejoinders may not correspond to what they would say in real life situation setting under real circumstances (cited by Golato, 2003: 4-5). Among other researchers, Robinson (1992) emphasises that any written instrument is likely to cause the respondents with ‘writing fatigue’ and that this can possibly deter them from writing down their contribution.

Nevertheless, it can be widely contended that W/DCT is a popular method of data collection in speech act studies according to Billmyer and Varghese (2000); Kwon (2004); Lin (2009); Ogiermann (2009); and Aufa (2013), since it is an effective means of gathering large amounts of data in a short period of time. It is also a fairly easy tool to administer, surpassing all other instruments in these respects according to Martínez-Flor and Usó-Juan (2011). Participants are usually cognisant of the procedures of its
administration. More importantly, they (2011) along with Rintell and Mitchell (1989) and Kasper (2000) found it to be producing data that are consistent with naturally occurring ones, or at least “similar enough to authentic language” according to Eslami-Rasekh (2005: 202). In the same vein, Billmyer and Varghese, (2000: 518) among other researchers, suggest WDCT has many administrative advantages attesting that it presents an approximation of naturally occurring data, which reinforces its validity as an instrument for collecting data. For instance, it is believed to allow more control over some of the contextual variables, which may influence the learners’ choices of particular forms, such as the respondent’s age, degree of familiarity, power relations (Martínez-Flor & Usó-Juan, 2011: 53). Therefore, it could allow researchers a better understanding of communication in such contrived contexts such as in classrooms. It would definitely lead to a better understanding of authentic communication revealing the respondent’s accumulated experience in a given context. In addition, it is claimed to be objective, has broad coverage, and is easy to interpret and score as in the recognition MDCT (Billmyer & Varghese, 2000).

Despite criticism levelled against the use of the DCT in eliciting authentic speech act behaviour, Beebe and Cumming (1996), Kasper and Rose (2002), Mey (2004), Woodfield (2006), among other researchers such as Nurani (2009) argue that if such instruments are carefully designed useful information may be received. More importantly, Maíz-Arévalo (2015) asserts that the DCT elicits common patterns with naturally occurring data. Kasper (2000: 329) pinpoints that the DCT is an effective data collection instrument when the objective of the investigation is “to inform the speakers’
pragmalinguistic knowledge of the strategic and linguistic forms by which communicative acts can be implemented, and about their sociopragmatic knowledge of the context factors under which particular strategies and linguistic choices are appropriate”. Hence, this study identifies with Kasper’s point because these are two of the objectives of this research, exploring the pragmalinguistic knowledge of the participants as well as their sociopragmatic knowledge.

The most extensive research on speech acts, the Cross-cultural Speech Act Realisation Project (CCSARP), Blum-Kulka et al. (1989), Eslami-Rasekh (2005), Jalilifar (2009), Mahani (2012), Eslami and Mirzaei (2014) among other studies have been conducted using the DCT. Aufa (2013: 113) as well as other supporters of W/MDCT for instance, Kasper and Rose (2002); Martínez-Flor and Usó-Juan (2011); Eslami and Mirzaei (2014) assert that it evaluates learners’ pragmatic competence effectively claiming that it demonstrates their actual awareness about the context that led them to produce such appropriate requests. That is why it is thought to be an appropriate instrument for the purpose of this study.

The participants of this study, in fact the learners, were encouraged to use their real language when they were assigned to complete the W/MDCT. Validating the choice of DCT and to avoid context vagueness, more contextual clues were provided to its prompt in order to enhance its situational background, besides employing some typographical enhancement techniques. Employing DCTs seems to perfectly correspond with the objectives of the study because the second research question
tends to explore the role of instruction in pragmatics on the learners' performance of target-like requests that are pragmalinguistically and sociopragmatically appropriate. Conclusively, the DCT has been selected as the most appropriate instrument to elicit data for the purpose of the investigation since it best suits the goal of this study. Also, it is noteworthy to mention that the returns of the W/MDCT were relatively high with more than 95% of returns (48 participants).

3.4.3. Self-reported Diaries:
A written diary record method is a reflective technique that is employed in this study. It could be construed as a written journal of events that would be kept on regular intervals. The participants' narrative self-reported diaries are journals that they inscribed in a bi-weekly log amounting up to at least four entries during the 10-week intervention.

Obtaining information from the learners, rather than making them practise the TL, is the purpose of log. They were allowed to write their journals in either English or Arabic as the language of communication in the entries. However, all participants chose to write their diaries in English. A set of questions to solicit and guide the participants’ records was prepared (see Appendix C). A set of core questions were given in the beginning of the intervention; additionally, every other week two questions were posted to all participants via email. This technique was followed to compartmentalise the participants’ total task into manageable subsets that they are likely to deal with. In other words, the participants had to respond to the core questions throughout the whole intervention, whereas the peripheral questions were to be handled every other week.
The journal was turned in once every other week, to which thorough answers and clarifications were provided to the learners’ questions, if they were deemed necessary. I kept my own records and reflections on a weekly basis to allow for more insights in the final data analysis in chapter six. These records are useful for the evaluation and amendments of the second cycle of the intervention.

Bailey and Ochsner (1983: 189) define a diary as "an account of a second language experience as recorded in a first-person journal". More recently, Griffee (2012: 199) describes journal writing as "student-to-teacher writing" in which she argues that 'authentic communication' can take place (Griffee, 2012: 201). It aims at boosting communication between the learner and the teacher and downscaling stress particularly for learners who are intimidated to voice their concerns or express themselves in public among other learners. Keeping personal accounts of classroom events, activities and details, including the learners’ feelings and attitudes towards their own language learning experience in a systematic manner is what makes up a diary. These journal entries, data, are to be thoroughly probed into looking for 'significant' patterns and events for interpretations and discussion.

3.4.3.1. Rationale for Using Self-Reported Diaries:
Strengthening the design of the study by coupling the DCTs with the returns of the self-reported diaries, i.e. triangulation, is likely to improve the quality of the research at hand (Rose & Ono, 1995). As a supplementary source of data, they were utilised to offset any subjectivity in the analysis of the production WDCTs. Therefore, analysis and drawn conclusions are more meaningful and insightful. Long (1980: 32) argues that "a
combination of methods plus some modifications in commonly used research designs is necessary if the field is to achieve its ultimate goal of testing a theory of second language acquisition with the aid of formal instruction”.

Self-reported diaries, an introspective research tool, are a potentially useful source for revealing the learners’ inner thoughts and attitudes regarding their overall pragmatic development. With such a discerning instrument, learners are seen to break away from pragmatic normative measures of pragmatic development in their L2 acquisition. The goal of utilising self-reported diaries is to delve deep into the learners’ personal language learning experience, documenting the emergence and overall progression of their pragmatic competence. According to Ochs (2008), self-reported diaries are ‘vehicle of expressing the self’ indicating the development of the L2. Nunan (1992: 118) observes that “diaries, logs and journals are important introspective tools in language research” which was echoed by other proponents of diaries such as Woodfield (1998); Al-Seghayer et al. (2001); Matsumoto (1989, 1996, 2002); Donovan & Pellegrino (2004); Gass and Mackey (2011); as well as Zafar and Meenakshi (2012). Braunwald and Brislin (1979: 22) claim that diary-based data might be neither amply broad nor adequately specific to address a sole issue. To avoid such pitfalls, this study employed a set of questions to ensure that these records provide richly detailed data that would strictly reflect the learners’ voice and attitudes towards their L2 learning experience. The data of the diaries were expected to be an individual production, employing either pen on paper mode or word-processed. As for the writing style, it is casual, informal and reflective, using the language with which the learners feel most comfortable. The scope of this technique is the developmental perspective from which to relate individual
aspects of the process of pragmatic development and acquisition to the larger whole of their CC. Thus, the data generated from these diaries were supplementary to these drawn from their production WDCTs and their scores on the recognition MDCTs.

Matsumoto (2002:19-20) emphasises self-reported diary or diary-keeping as a tool falls into the category of qualitative techniques, which has been employed by researchers in second or foreign language classroom process research and classroom-centred research over the past decades. It aims at exploring various features of classroom language learning and teaching. More recent research, Matsumoto (1989, 2002); Chamot (2004) among other scholars such as Gaies (1983), Bailey and Ochsner (1983) state diary keeping provides scope for sufficient investigation. It allows the researcher to obtain ample evidence of the learning processes of L2 learners with magnanimous and clear insights about their mental states or thought processes involved in their language learning experience and interaction. This, in turn, brings about a more complete understanding of the processes underlying second/foreign language learning and teaching.

Another noteworthy advantage of diaries is that they do the groundwork for further experimental investigation for the phenomenon at hand providing more than surface level of understanding. This technique is employed in a complementary manner to the quantitative instrumentation to allow for the findings’ further refinement in order to arrive at valid analyses and better understanding of SLA processes according to Chaudron (1986: 714). In order to have access to some introspective data about the learners’ holistic learning/acquisition process, self-reported diaries were selected as an
appropriate tool of investigation revealing their perspective as ‘insiders’. One of the objectives of the study is to explore the voice of the learners with respect to their learning experience (assuming it to be dynamic), where this technique is expected to engage the learners as observers of their own learning experience, allowing for their mental involvement.

As for the limitations of this tool, Carter (2006) emphasises one of the dilemmas posed by utilising diaries as a data collection instrument is that the learners provided the data in their own time rather than in the class time without any external motivation. This study managed to engage the learners so that they would be providing the required data for the study by creating circumstances as comfortable and as positive as possible. To this effect, the employed approach was structured by preparing a set of questions to prompt them to provide their own thoughts and reflections. These questions are sort of loose rather than confining guidelines. They were expected to provide data that were both summative and formative evaluation of the learners’ mental state and learning experience. These precautions are followed to avoid deterring learners’ from keeping their diaries in a fairly structured manner by focusing them on the required topics for reflection without restricting their contributions. To counteract a different challenge of self-reported diaries, their time consuming aspect or the learners’ fatigue according to Fry (1988), the diary entries were kept to the minimum, i.e. one entry every other week, a minimum of four entries in the whole duration, to avoid causing them fatigue.
A further methodological caveat was whether these diaries should be written in the learners’ first language (L1) or the foreign language (L2), English in this case. This issue was dealt with in the light of the literature on diaries, which advocates keeping it in the learners’ L1 particularly if the researchers share the same L1 with their learners. According to Hilleson (1996) as quoted by Carter (2006), if we were to ask the learners to write their contributions in the diaries using their L2, they would be highly influenced by their L2 proficiency. This was thought to be one of the extraneous variables that would highly impact the quality and the quantity of these contributions altogether. Hence, the learners were allowed to invariably use both languages with neither penalties nor rewards for whichever language they used.

Since the objective of this instrument is to find out more about the learners’ voice, reflections, and attitudes, rather than their language proficiency or their grammatical competency, it was reckoned futile to correct their language and expressions or judge their linguistic competency in this instrument. Electronic diaries were thought to be acceptable where I would not have to suffer to decipher the learners’ handwriting. Therefore, both handwritten and electronic diaries were acceptable as forms of self-reported diaries in this study. Besides, there is no plan to correct or edit the content of their contribution in any way, given the main objective for using them. The deadline for submitting these diaries was two weeks after the end of the intervention, and thus it was not totally flexible. This was considered to guarantee the learners’ active memory and involvement in relation to their learning experience. There was no intervention in the
learners’ contributions in their logs by giving any information or opinions, however questions were allowed (Ogane, 1997, cited in Griffee (2012: 202).

Employing diaries seems meaningful and worth utilisation, because the present study is on the learning of English as a foreign language. This means that acquisition takes place almost entirely in formal instructional settings, confined to the controlled classroom situation, with paucity of exposure to the TL. They allowed for valid self-reported data by probing into the learners’ learning reflections and thoughts shedding light on the imperceptible aspects of their language learning experience. These factors were thought to be likely facilitative or to possibly hinder the acquisition of pragmatic competence in foreign language learning in the classroom. Nevertheless, according to Taylor et al. (2013: 4) such qualitative approaches are neither generalizable with ‘easy interpretable pedagogical advice’ nor has the potential to influence the educational policy or practice. In fact, they are highly context-dependent according to Mercer (2011: 4). However, their interpretations together with their findings provide practitioners and foreign language instructors with ample data familiarising them with significant individuals’ perspectives and attitudes in foreign language learning contexts, an issue that warrants strong scrutiny in foreign language classroom research.

With reference to reliability and validity, a few measures were considered to safeguard against any biased responses by the learners and to secure more reliable and valid data. Another adverse issue, which self-reported diaries poses, is reliability. As one person undertook the analysis of the data, subjectivity was a possibility that needed
consideration. This was counteracted by having these diaries examined as supplementary to other qualitative and quantitative techniques like questionnaires, the W/MDCTs. Analyses and interpretations drawn from one instrument were compared and contrasted in the light of the rest of the data yielded from the other instruments. If the same conclusions were reached from all instruments, i.e. they were matched and supported, validation could be strengthened. Thus, the identified patterns from the journal entries were utilised to either validate or controvert the findings and conclusions of the other instruments.

Validity is an additional concern that would be invariably addressed equally to reliability, where the precision of description and measurement of variables in L2 language learning posed a challenge. Creating a non-threatening learning environment in which learners were allowed to write their comments, thoughts, feelings, and reflections openly and honestly was thought to encourage them to provide their contribution using honest and sincere expressions. In fact, as previously mentioned, they were allowed to use their L1, to encourage unreserved self-expression. Moreover, the diaries being an individual expression of a particular experience should eliminate any hyper-consciousness of any judgments made on the learners. The learners were allowed to use their initials only which were changed by pseudonyms later on in the research. As per Miles and Huberman (1994: 277), some of my academic peers who are involved in the same field of interest were asked to comment on the plausibility of the drawn conclusions, alternatives, whether they could trace them back to the raw data to further enhance the validity of the conclusions reached (to avoid holistic fallacy & the
researcher’s going native). These colleagues were PhD holders in linguistics and applied linguistics as well as MA holders in Teaching English as a Foreign Language who have relevant previous experience in research involving human participants and qualitative data analysis. Besides, some of the participants were invited to examine the preliminary analysis, finding out whether the inferences that the researcher made are supported by the data. Griffee (2012: 207) claims that reliability and validity of the subjective self-report data are seldom needed, resting his argument on the fact that participants are likely to be truthful in reporting on their own feelings and thoughts.

3.5. Procedures:
It should be pointed out that all participants were provided with paraphrases and explanations of the situations included in all tasks when it was necessary. It was found that a full understanding of the situations was of paramount importance in order to complete the tasks. However, no Arabic was used because using these DCTs aims to simulate a real-life encounter for these participants using foreign language in communicating their needs and understanding their interlocutors. In real-life situations, it was not expected that they would have someone to translate for them; however, they would have interlocutors who are keen on achieving successful communication cooperating and negotiating meaning with them. To this end, part of the planning was to stimulate a context in which the participants were provided with the required explanation, negotiation of meaning, rather than interfering using the participants’ L1 and translating using Arabic.
Research participants were asked to complete the W/MDCTs questionnaires in order to find out their ILP competence whether in perception/recognition or production in making requests in English. Each questionnaire whether the recognition or the production DCT took almost 30-40 minutes to complete amounting up to 60-80 minutes for the two DCTs. The responses were collected from perception/ recognition MDCTs and then rated as correct/incorrect: 1/0, and the total frequency of the participants’ judgments were analysed. As for the production WDCT, data from pre-intervention evaluation and post- intervention evaluation were analysed and codified afterwards taking into account the amount and type of request linguistic realisations. Data were classified in line with the modified Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) suggested typology of request acts with the taxonomy of modifications. This framework is illustrated later in this chapter as in section 3.7, which includes direct, conventionally indirect and non-conventionally indirect request forms. The total frequency and percentage of the head acts as well as both external and internal modifications used by participants were calculated, because one of our main aims was to ascertain the role of instruction in producing request strategies to realise requests as a speech act.

3.5.1. Data Collection Procedures:
The administration of the CLC was contacted to secure their permission for the conduct of this research at their institution. Then, both the administration and the teaching staff were informed about the purpose of the research. They were made conversant with the utilised procedures and the proposed schedule for the project. They assisted in administering the DCTs to the participants in accordance with the agreed schedule. All the participants were notified that they have the right to withdraw from this study at any
moment they wish. Afterwards, they were provided with a detailed explanation of the
data collection procedures and explanation of the instructions, which was delivered to
them in simple English. All the participants were asked to read and give their written
consent if they wish to participate in the study and they were given the information
sheet about the study as well (see appendix F).

Prior to administering the DCT questionnaires in the pre-intervention phase, all
respondents were required to complete a paper-based socio-economic background
questionnaire. In this questionnaire, they provided some of their demographic features
including information about their nationalities, their place of residence, their study of
English, their length of exposure to it, and their background information. This data
ensured homogeneity of participants in the study (see appendix G).

As previously mentioned, both groups were administered the pre-intervention
W/MDCTs. Then, they received the intervention during which they would also have to
write up four entries of self-reported diaries. Finally, they did their post-intervention
W/MDCTs. The questionnaires were administered to both groups. As for the
researcher, I am an English teacher with almost 15 years of teaching experience as
well as previous experience in administering questionnaires as part of my Master's
studies and research work. Instructions were given in simple English, no Arabic was
used, yet further explanation was necessary besides the instruction given in the
questionnaire itself using simple English, as mentioned earlier. Consequently, the
whole instruction was delivered in English.
3.5.2. Pre-intervention Evaluation:
The pre-intervention evaluation was administered with the two W/MDCTs to the two groups before the intervention.

3.5.3. Post-intervention Evaluation:
The post-intervention evaluation was administered with the two W/MDCTs to the two groups after the intervention.

3.5.4. Self-reported Diaries:
During the period of the intervention, the participants were required to write up at least four entries of self-reported diaries as reflections on their attitude towards their language learning experience. In addition, I wrote down my own comments and reflections on the study to be used as insights while analysing the data. These field notes were found as a useful introspective tool allowing for more “interactive decisions…to provide optimal support for learning …to respond to the students’ needs” according to Richards and Lockhart (2002: 84).

3.6. Intervention and Materials:
The focus of this study is limited to the speech act of request because requests occur very frequently in everyday situations. This makes NNSs' use of it one of the pressing needs when dealing with NSs. Halupka-Rešetar (2014) concurs with Schauer (2009) and states that requests making involves multiple actions and also a variety of interlocutors. It entails significant cross-cultural differences in the linguistic forms used for formulating requests. Thus, L2 learners need to be able to evaluate appropriately
the contextual conditions of the situation and then express their request using the appropriate linguistic forms.

The intervention was administered by the teacher-researcher, the reflective-practitioner, who aims at understanding, refining teaching/learning practice, and finally effecting educational change. The designed intervention is informed by the theory of CC originally proposed by Hymes (1972), and Brown’s (2007) Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), Richard Schmidt’s (1993) Noticing Hypothesis, as well as Sharwood Smith’s (1991, 1993) Input Enhancement technique. It involves awareness raising exercises, implicit and explicit activities dealing with the sociopragmatic conditions and the pragmalinguistic features and factors governing pragmatic use and functions of requests. It includes explicit metapragmatic explanation conjoined with opportunities for practice. The intervention was delivered over 10 weeks, with a two-hour period every week, making a total of 20 hours of instruction. The prepared material was given in addition to the regular course curriculum that had to be covered.

The intervention took into consideration that EFL learners either do not receive enough pragmatic input or that they may not notice relevant pragmatic input due to lack of pragmatic awareness or the lack of saliency of the pragmatic features in the available input. In other words, if NNSs or learners were more aware of NSs’ norms, they could have made informed decisions on how to best behave pragmatically (Cook, 2001).
Knowing this, the designed activities aim at systematically developing the participants’ pragmatic competence offering them ample opportunities for pragmatic acquisition and interactive practice. Offering authentic language samples, these activities focus on the raising the participants’ awareness of cross-culturally diverse patterns to help them notice certain pragmatic features. Hence, the learners were able to identify and observe the linguistic and the cultural conventions that govern appropriate production and use of the language, to eventually and ultimately have their sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic competencies promoted. The pragmatic competence features and components that were given most emphasis in the activities of the intervention are the speech act strategies in meaningful interactions.

Another pragmatic aspect that this intervention highlighted was that of politeness, as in the dichotomy of directness/indirectness. That is, participants were sensitised to the fact that directness and indirectness are context-sensitive, there are supposed to be different degrees of directness according to the context, the parties involved in this context. Thus, the learners’ awareness was drawn to the different pragmatic aspects of the TL according to which they would decide on their level of directness.

The intervention included a set of programmed instructional material that introduced request formulas, rules that govern the use of such formulas, strategies and interpretations of their use. This material focused on promoting the learners’ pragmatic competence in utilising requests. Simulated situations were used where NSs were employing requests in various authentic contexts, from which the learners were able to
practise the native-like pragmatic features in authentic interactions using raising awareness techniques and explicit metapragmatic explanations about target-structures, forms, and functions. Kilickaya (2004) advocates the use of authentic language in instruction whenever possible as one of the important principles of communicative language teaching. The definition of authentic materials that this study identifies with is that of Rogers (1988). Rogers (1988: 467, cited in Kilickaya, 2004) defines authentic material as “‘appropriate’ and ‘quality’ in terms of goals, objectives, learner needs and interest and ‘natural’ in terms of real life and meaningful communication.” For instance, a mix of authentic videotaped and audiotaped short dialogues situations conducted by NSs using requests were utilised as well as some film clips that were performed and filmed by NSs and English teachers. According to Fernández Guerra (2008); Martínez-Flor (2008), video-enhanced materials tend to encourage learners to participate in the activity at hand. These videos inspire the learners by breaking the boredom of the classroom activities and it adds to the learners’ engagement according to Sherman (2003), Jernigan (2007, 2012), Rose (2009), Abrams (2014), Zangoei et al. (2014), as well as Derakhshan and Eslami (2015).

The employed tasks were based on those simulated situations in order to train the learners to recognise and produce the diversity of target-like requests' formulas and their use in a variety of contexts. Accordingly, there were implicit techniques to raise the learners' awareness of the pragmatic features pertinent to performing requests using visual input enhancement devices to draw their attention. Besides, there was explicit instruction on the related metapragmatic information based on those situations.
The material deals with the pragmalinguistic and the sociopragmatic parameters of requests. For example, the learners were required to consider the contexts according to three pragmatic parameters: size of imposition, social status, and power issues involved (sociopragmatic aspects) (researcher’s emphasis).

3.6.1. Teacher’s Guide and Instruction:
As it has been the case for many decades, it is commonly recognised that the goal of language teaching is to develop learners’ CC (Canale & Swain, 1980), i.e. the ability to communicate appropriately in a given TL and culture (Lin et al., 2009). The purpose of the present study is concerned with exploring the role of pragmatic instruction on learners’ recognition and performance. Subsequently, it is assumed that pragmatic instruction would affect the learners’ degree of pragmatic competence, namely that of recognition/perception and performance of request formulations.

Informed by many researchers such as Alcón-Soler (2005, 2008a); Félix-Brasdefer (2008); Takimoto (2008, 2009); Nguyen et al. (2012); Fordyce (2013); and Kim (2016) among others who investigated and compared implicit and explicit conditions as the two proposed approaches of instruction on pragmatic enhancement, this study employed a mix of these two approaches in coaching the prepared materials (Glaser, 2014). The learners were exposed to native-like production as the model production (appropriate input) using input enhancement techniques, such as emboldening, underlining, and italicising key pragmatic features. In the lead-in phase, pragmatic awareness was implicitly raised of these features and parameters in various instances. They were required to identify request forms in the scripts of the videos and provide
justification for their choices which involved metapragmatic discussions. Afterwards, the learners were explicitly provided with detailed metapragmatic explanations about target-structures, forms, functions, and why certain forms are culturally preferred blended in meaningful practice. The pragmatic parameters of the context and the interlocutors’ roles were all discussed in pairs and then in groups using a mix of mediums (spoken versus written) and modes (dialogues, face-to-face, or indirect). By the end of this stage, making requests were explicitly emphasised as well as the strategies involved to realise these requests. Both explicit and implicit inputs were available for learners to enable them to notice such pragmatic aspects deductively or inductively (Glaser, 2014). On one level, they deduced information from explicit explanations and rules. Using explicit metapragmatic explanation allows the learners to rely on their cognitive capacities, pushing them to notice the target forms using greater depth of processing. There is a general consensus that the instructor-researcher’s explicit instruction in pragmatics would help learners focus on pragmatic form through metapragmatic explanation, speech act patterns, rules, and strategies, together with their simple observation and experience with the TL (Taguchi, 2015; Takahashi, 2010a; Dastjerdi, & Rezvani, 2010). It is contended that substantial and durable instructional gains should be yielded using explicit metapragmatic instruction according to Alcón-Soler (2005) and Takahashi (2010a). On another level, they induced key knowledge via observation, intuition, and analogy. They would subconsciously compare their L1 and L2 sociocultural norms to notice the gap, the mismatch. They discovered some of the rules on their own in an early stage with the ample chance to revise, confirm their hypotheses of what makes an appropriate request in the TL. They were guided to
formulate appropriate form-function-context mappings. A variety of awareness raising tasks and activities were utilised in order to sensitise the learners to the pragmatic aspects (see appendix D). It is assumed that an assortment of these implicit learning activities would produce robust pragmatic knowledge. It is widely believed that the learners’ attention and engagement in cognitive processing are essential factors in effective implicit treatment (Takimoto, 2009, 2012).

The administration of the intervention was broken down into three stages namely, a **Warm-Up stage**, a **pragmatic consciousness-raising stage**, and finally **communicative practice stage**. To begin with, in the warm-up stage, the participants’ attention was drawn to the difference between their L1 and its cultural background and the TL and its cultural context. Additionally, the sociolinguistic and sociocultural variables behind the act of requesting in both the L1 and the TL were explored. They were exposed to appropriate input, NSs’ requests highlighting the key elements of a request using the input enhancement tools, the external and the internal modification devices used. Afterwards, the **pragmatic consciousness-raising stage**, the participants were exposed to appropriate input, NSs’ requests, explicitly taught what a request is, highlighting the importance of modification devices and their types and tools. They were also provided with raising awareness tasks in which the learners’ attention was directed to the setting, the interlocutors, their relationship and social distance, the power issues involved, the size of imposition of the target request, all the target pragmatic features and the sociolinguistic variables pertinent to speech event at hand. In addition, they practised recognising request strategies and modification devices.
Finally, in the *communicative practice* stage, the participants were provided with opportunities to use request strategies and devices for modification in simulated communicative contexts whether in writing or orally. The order of these stages conform to Bardovi-Harlig’s (2003: 38) suggestion that pragmatic instruction activities should provide the learners with input before their attempt to interpret and produce.

**3.6.1.1. Warm-Up Stage:**
This was the initial stage in the intervention. The purpose of the warm-up stage was to activate the learners’ schemata by eliciting ideas and information regarding what they already know about requests and the difference between their L1 and the TL speech patterns. Learners were exposed to appropriate input, NSs’ requests via videos excerpts. According to Derakhshan and Eslami (2015), familiarising learners with the similarities and the differences between their L1-TL using videos which authenticate real life situations bringing it to the classroom context is considered to be effective method of instruction in pragmatics. It is believed that this type of instruction has a facilitative role in pragmatic competence bringing about robust instructional gains in the learners’ pragmatic competence. This stage was meant to direct the participants’ attention to the sociolinguistic and sociocultural variables behind the act of requesting in both the L1 and the TL. It employed the learners’ already established pragmatic system in their L1 as a spring board for their pragmatic development in the L2. It underscored successful use of strategic similarities that they can employ and the imperceptible differences that they are liable to stumble in yielding non-target like utterances.
With reference to the raising-awareness activities, Safont-Jordà (2004) recommends that learners should be asked to think about requests that are used in daily L1 interactions in academic life situations, daily-life interactions etc. There was special focus on both the linguistic manifestations and the sociopragmatic features in which the request is embedded, namely, interlocutors' occupation, the degree of imposition involved in the request, the setting, etc. A number of elicitation questions were employed referring to the learners’ L1 and culture, as in ‘What do people say to express requests in your first language?’, e.g. ‘While requesting something from someone in your first language, do you take into consideration the status of the person you are requesting from?’. These questions were used to elucidate that some speech acts i.e. request in their first language may be subject to a variety of sociolinguistic and sociocultural variables e.g., size of imposition, social distance, and power as parameters of Brown and Levinson’s (1987) politeness theory.

Learners were primarily instructed with learning targets on what making a request involves. They watched dialogues in which segments of the speech act of request were embedded. They were instructed to answer some preparatory questions, which were meaning-focused. The activities they received in the hand-outs involved request strategies that were typographically enhanced highlighting the key pragmatic features: head act and peripheries. The learners were provided with ample chance to practise recognising request its components, strategies and the modification devices employed. This stage served as an introduction to ideas in pragmatics in a context, the ‘secret rules’ according to Bardovi-Harlig (2003: 38).
3.6.1.2. Pragmatic Consciousness-raising Stage:

In the second stage, the learners were presented with language situations that involve requests. Working in pairs or small groups they were asked to recognise both the pragmalinguistic forms and the sociopragmatic factors (size of imposition, social distance, and power) that influence the appropriateness of request mitigating or aggravating devices. The types of strategies that can be used when requesting were highlighted and whether the forms are direct, conventionally indirect or non-conventionally indirect along with the softening devices that accompany these requests. Here a variety of activities were used to further develop both the learners’ awareness of cross-cultural and cross-linguistic differences between their L1 and the TL, as well as their pragmatic awareness of the TL norms of behaviour.

The participants were provided with hand-outs that embraced direct awareness-raising tasks together with questions that solicited metapragmatic information on the TL request forms and discussions on the use of appropriate requests. They were explicitly instructed to what a request is, highlighting the importance of modification devices and their types and tools along with the factors that govern their variance. Apart from receiving explicit instruction on the linguistic manifestations and formulas for conveying the speech of requesting, the strategies used and their softening devices i.e. pragmalinguistic aspects were highlighted. Learners were taught those social and contextual variables that qualify a request, sociopragmatic features of the situation. Here it should be noted that power, social distance, and size of imposition were observed and highlighted as the key parameters that define the social context. A wide variety of naturally occurring requests taken from academic and daily life, social
situations were utilised in the intervention materials to expose learners to the array of situations they might encounter in the real-life.

3.6.1.3. Communicative Practice Stage:
In this final stage, learners were provided with written and oral opportunities to use request strategies and modification devices in simulated communicative contexts. It is viewed as a chance to practise and try out these new forms and patterns in an accepting environment, the classroom, away from any academic or face-threatening risks in public-performance. With regard to these written and oral activities, learners were presented with a situation, rich in pragmatic information, and they were required to make a request to the particular person indicated in the situation. The learners considered the social distance between the interlocutors, the speaker’s power over the hearer, the imposition involved in the request. Having reflected on all these sociocultural aspects, learners were asked to work in pairs and act out in a role-play fashion how the situation is likely to follow to make room for more authenticity and break away from the contrived setting of the classroom. They were presented with a wide variety of scenarios with differing sociopragmatic features in a timely fashion in order to observe whether these variables affect their choice of the request strategy and its modification devices. Assuming specific roles in hypothetical situations, the learners interacted with their peers and made inferences about interlocutors, their roles, and the context they are assumed to take part in. They made informed linguistic choices based on contextual variables meanwhile developing their own self-observation skill monitoring their own pragmatic development preparing them for untrodden communicative encounters. This practice was followed by the instructor’s informative feedback and explicit metapragmatic reflection on their performance to further sharpen
their understanding of the pragmatic issue under instruction. This corrective feedback (reactive) was provided on their production in which any inappropriate use of target items was explicitly corrected in a non-threatening manner. This constructive feedback sensitised learners with the non-native-like request forms, it allowed them the opportunity to compare their output forms with more native-like request forms and models according to Fukuya and Zhang (2002). This phase should enhance the learners’ ability to reflect on their own pragmatic development, which was recorded in some of their self-reported diaries.

With reference to Bardovi-Harlig (2003), with such an instruction, learners were found to maintain their own cultural identities meanwhile communicating and participating into the TL community. They maintained some of their L1 conventional behaviours which diverged with the TL. They were given a chance to expand their perception of the TL as well as its community. They were allowed to choose for themselves how much and how far they would like to include in their own repertoire of cultural norms whilst gaining more insights into the target culture. Learners were gratified to know more about pragmatics and its rules; to them, it is like being “let into a secret”, the gate into the secret norms of the TL (see Chapter 6).

3.7. Data Analysis:
The data were both verbal (linguistic) and numerical. The data were broken down to the participants’ verbal production drawn from the production WDCT in the pre-and post-intervention evaluation tasks as well as the self-reported diaries. The numerical scores were drawn from the perception/recognition MDCT in the pre-and post-intervention evaluation tasks. The perception MDCT provided the statistical information about each
participant’s perception score. Thus, they received either one or zero for their correct or incorrect perceptions, respectively. The data gathered from the production WDCT were linguistically described and analysed based on the typology of modifiers and the English language pragmatic norms, the Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) modified coding scheme. Baseline data for the recognition MDCT were developed using ten NSs of English from the UK, USA, and Australia where they provided their judgments and intuitions on what they would consider as an appropriate (native-like) or an inappropriate request to the proposed situations. The baseline data were used to rate the recognition MDCTs as the presence or the absence of the target-like pragmatic judgments.

3.7.1. Statistical Analysis:
The DCTs were designed to measure the effectiveness of pedagogical instruction in English language pragmatic aspects on the development of their interlanguage pragmatic competence of EFL learners with intermediate language proficiency. The perception/recognition MDCT has a binary scale (1 = correct or 0 = incorrect) to measure the students’ perception of the presence or absence of the target-like use of requests.

The data drawn from the MDCTs were codified and analysed using one type of data analysis procedures: descriptive statistics followed by the *paired t-test*, a parametric procedure. The *paired t-test* has been decided on to compare two sets of measurements in which the data were drawn from the same groups, pre-and post the intervention. The first step was to calculate the descriptive statistics, as in describing the shape of the distribution of the data, measuring the average and the variance.
As for the distribution of the data, Perry (2005: 164-165) states the data have to be examined if they were systematically distributed conforming to a normal curve of distribution, not skewed to decide whether “certain statistics should not be used”. They are basically a graphical illustration of the frequency certain participants obtained particular total scores, ranging from the lowest to the highest scores.

The second step was to work out the average of the data, i.e. the mean, the median and the mode for the two groups on the pre-and the post-intervention evaluation tasks. It aims at identifying the average zone, including just above and just below the score obtained by the majority or the usual score. This tendency zone as Perry (2005) suggests, is referred to by the three measures: the mean, the median and the mode. This was processed by “adding up all the score and dividing [them] up by the total number of scores” to determine the mean of the data according to Perry’s (2005: 165) definition. Then the median was examined, which is with reference to Perry’s (2005: 165) account is the “middle point in the distribution of the data that divides the number of people in half”. Last, the mode was figured out by identifying ‘the most frequent score’ in the data, according to Perry (2005: 165). However, this study has depended on the mean score to a great extent to indicate the average zone rather than the median and the mode. The statistical significance of the difference between the means of the pre-intervention and the post-intervention for each group were computed.

As for measuring the variance of the data, the standard of deviation (SD) was computed in this third step. This step is dependent on the prior step, calculating the
mean score. In fact, the SD is determined by examining the average deviation of scores from the mean. The range was also worked out, which, according to Perry (2005: 165) is “the distance from the lowest to the highest scores.”

On deciding on which procedure to follow, the parametric was chosen based on many features according to Mackey and Gass (2005). To start with, the normalcy of the distribution of the data, they are interval data, scores on the task. On employing the paired t-test, each participant’s performance is paired with himself or herself on the two evaluation tasks, before intervention compared with his or her own performance after the intervention. The means of two groups were examined to find out if they were significantly different from one another. Ultimately, the paired t-test was assumed to be an appropriate procedure because the first research question this study aims at is to explore the extent to which instruction in pragmatics affects the learners’ ability to make judgments about the appropriateness of requests (see Chapter 4).

3.7.2. Linguistic (Verbal) Analysis:
On the other hand, the production WDCT was designed to elicit requests from the participants, where they provided requests to the proposed situations. That production was linguistically described extrapolating the major patterns and tendencies. Afterwards, they were analysed based on the proposed framework analysis of speech act modifications that is used in this study, types of modification (both external and internal) and the frequency of their usage. The data were analysed based on the participants’ syntactic choice of formulaic language (the modal used such as the “could”, “would”, or “can” formulas), and the lexical appropriateness of this choice in accordance of the sociocultural parameters of the specific situation. The devices under
scrutiny include both lexical and syntactic downgraders, upgraders and both mitigating and aggravating supportive moves.

3.7.2.1. **Framework of Linguistic Analysis:**

As for the data elicited by the WDCT, data were coded using the Blum-Kulka *et al.* (1989) modified coding scheme, which provided detailed description of request head acts strategies, and forms of internal and external modification. Detailed examples were provided in the results. The main four categories of analysis were: level of directness of requests strategy head act, external modification of the head act, internal modification of the head act, and the length of the entire request act. Regarding the level of directness of requests strategy head act this involves direct strategies (D), conventionally indirect strategies (CID), and non-conventionally indirect strategies (NCID). With reference to the external modification of the head act, it embraces supportive moves to mitigate the face-threatening forces, alerters warning the hearer of the upcoming speech act, grounders to provide the interlocutor with reason for the incurring request. In relation to the internal modification of the head act, it comprises of syntactical and lexical or phrasal modifiers within the head act to either soften or intensify the force of the request. Finally, the length of the entire request act contains the head act and the extent of its elaborateness.

3.7.2.1.1. **Levels of Directness of Request Strategies:**

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, based on the transparency of the illocutionary force, Blum-Kulka *et al.* (1989) categorised requests strategies according to the decreasing degree of directness ranging from relatively transparent strategies to extremely opaque ones. The illocutionary force of the utterance for the D requests is
indicated via lexical means only communicating the most direct request possible as in: “Leave me alone”. Fixed linguistic conventions are used to express the illocution in the CID requesting to which linguistic content in conjunction with contextual cues are used to interpret meaning. For example, "Would you mind closing the door behind you?" The NCID requests require the requestee to figure out the force of illocution from the interaction of the locution with its context depending on the contextual cues only, for instance, "Are you going to visit your mother now?"

As previously mentioned, the yielded data from the production WDCT were analysed linguistically, by identifying the main linguistic expression used by the learners. Then they were classified into different directness levels based on the coding system adapted from Blum-Kulka et al.’s CCSARP framework (1989) involving several types of requests expressions amounting to nine types. To illustrate, direct requests have imperatives, performatives (hedged & explicit), obligations, and want statements. Conventionally indirect requests include preparatory and suggestions, whereas non-conventionally indirect requests involve strong hints and mild hints. Identifying with Taguchi’s (2006: 521) structure, where Blum-Kulka et al.’s (1989) framework was further extended adding several expression types; this study analysed the learners’ production. To illustrate, preparatory questions, mitigated preparatory, and mitigated wants were added to Blum-Kulka et al.’s (1989) framework to amount to a total of twelve types. It is believed that these modifications and further analysis would enhance and fine-grain the linguistic analysis of the participants’ production.

Table 3.2 summarises a combination of degree of directness and strategy types CCSARP project (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989: 18, cited in Taguchi, 2006: 521):
Table 3.2: The Three Degrees of Directness of Strategies in a Request (Jalilafar, 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of directness</th>
<th>Requests Type and meaning</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Direct Expressions</td>
<td>1. <strong>Imperatives</strong>: Utterances in which the grammatical mood of the verb signals illocutionary force</td>
<td>Please lend me a pen. Clean up the mess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. <strong>Performatives (hedged)</strong>: Utterances in which statement of the illocutionary force is modified by hedging expressions</td>
<td>I want to ask you to lend me a pen. I would like to ask you to prepare my bill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. <strong>Performatives (explicit)</strong>: Utterances in which the illocutionary force is explicitly named</td>
<td>I am asking you to lend me a pen. I tell you to leave me alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. <strong>Obligation statements</strong>: Utterances which state the obligation of the hearer to carry out the act</td>
<td>You have to clean the mess. Sir, you'll have to move your car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. <strong>Want statements</strong>: Utterances which state the speaker's desire that the hearer carries out the act</td>
<td>I want you to lend me a pen. I really wish you'd stop smoking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Indirect Expressions</td>
<td>6. <strong>Preparatory questions</strong>: Utterances containing reference to preparatory conditions (e.g. ability, willingness) as conventionalised in any specific language</td>
<td>Could you lend me a pen? Would you mind moving your car?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Conventionally indirect</td>
<td>7. <strong>Suggestions</strong>: Utterances which contain a suggestion</td>
<td>How about lending me a pen? How about cleaning up?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. <strong>Permissions</strong>: Utterances which ask for a permission</td>
<td>May I borrow a pen? May I borrow your keys?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. <strong>Mitigated preparatory</strong>: Utterances containing reference to preparatory conditions (e.g. ability, willingness) as conventionalised in any specific language embedded with in another clause</td>
<td>I'm wondering if you could lend me a pen. I'm wondering if you could move your car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. <strong>Mitigated wants</strong>: Utterances which contain a statement of want in a hypothetical situation referring to the speaker's desire that the hearer carries out the act</td>
<td>I would appreciate it if you could lend me a pen. I would appreciate it if move your car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Non-conventionally indirect</td>
<td>11. <strong>Strong hints</strong>: Utterances containing partial reference to object or element needed for the implementation of the act</td>
<td>My pen just quit. I need a pen. You have left the kitchen in a terrible mess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. <strong>Mild hints</strong></td>
<td>Can you guess what I want? We've been playing this game for over an hour now.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Taguchi’s (2006) coding framework for requests based on Blum-Kulka *et al.* (1989) CCSARP
In the Cross-cultural Speech Act Realisation Project (CCSARP) (Blum- Kulka et al., 1989a/b) three levels of directness for request strategies were distinguished as the coding scheme. Blum-Kulka (1982) defines head act as the main structure that is employed to make requests and that it is often accompanied by the use of lexical/phrasal downgraders (internal modification), such as the use of please, or supportive moves (external modification).

3.7.2.1.2. Components of Requests:
Halupka-Rešetar (2014: 33) states that according to the CCSARP, a request involves three main parts: (a) the alerter or the address term, (b) the head act, and (c) the supportive moves.

I. Alerters
They are the opening elements that verbally call for attention. They include items such as attention getters (Excuse me, Pardon me, etc.) and terms of address (Mrs. Hughes, Mr. Smith, etc.)

II. Head Act
The head act is the smallest unit of an utterance that conveys a request. It is the core of the speech act sequence and its only obligatory part. The previously mentioned D, CID, and NCID strategies fall within this head act.

III. Supporting Moves
Supportive moves are modifications devices used to modify requests that lead up or come after the head act and they affect the context in which the actual act is embedded. Their function is either mitigating (downgrading) or aggravating (enhancing) the illocutionary force of the request (Halupka-Rešetar, 2014: 34). Faerch and Kasper
(1989) broke down these supportive moves into internal and external modifications devices. The former modification is achieved through devices within the same head act, while the latter is situated within its immediate context. The levels of directness of the act as well as the content of proposition are never altered in neither case of modification.

1) External Modifications:

External modifications (supportive moves) are peripheral to the head act. They are additional statements, which serve the purpose of supporting the request proper, to set the context for it, i.e. to modify its illocutionary force by either mitigating or aggravating it. Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) CCSARP classify the external modifications in requests, in their coding scheme, as supportive moves that may be attached either before or after the head act to mitigate the illocutionary force of the request. External modification might serve to either soften or emphasise the force of the whole request. Table 3.3 below gives the final taxonomy of external modifications used in this study (adapted from Halupka-Rešetar, 2014: 34; Woodfield, 2012; & Xiao-le, 2011: 109), following Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) and Sifianou (1999) where two additional modification types were fused in the final taxonomy to enhance and fine-tune the analysis:
Table 3.3: Taxonomy of External Modifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Devices</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Grounder                 | A clause which can either precede or follow a request and allows the speaker to give reasons, explanations or justifications for his or her request.                                                           | 'I would like an assignment extension because I cannot submit because I had some problems at home.'  
|                             |                                                                                                                                            | 'I wasn’t in class the other day because I was sick.'                                                                                                                                             |  |
| 2. Disarmer                 | A phrase with which “a speaker tries to remove any potential objections the hearer might raise upon being confronted with the request” (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989: 287)  
|                             | “The speaker indicates awareness of a potential offense and thereby possible refusal” (Xiao-le, 2011: 109)                                                                 | 'I know that this assignment is important but could you...?'  
|                             |                                                                                                                                            | 'I know this is short notice.'                                                                                                                                                                       |  |
| 3. Preparator               | The speaker prepares the hearer for the ensuing request. It might also be to check the hearer’s availability (Xiao-le, 2011: 109)                                                                     | 'I really need a favour...'  
|                             |                                                                                                                                            | 'Hey, you had this management class, right?'                                                                                                                                                        |  |
| 3. Getting pre-commitment   | The speaker checks on a potential refusal before performing the request by trying to get the hearer to commit.                                                                                              | 'Could you do me a favour?'                                                                                                                                                                          |  |
| 5. Promise (of reward)      | The speaker makes a promise to be fulfilled upon completion of the requested act.                                                                                                                      | 'Could you give me an extension? I promise I'll have it ready by tomorrow.'  
|                             |                                                                                                                                            | 'I'll buy you dinner.'                                                                                                                                                                               |  |
| 6. Imposition minimiser/    | "The speaker tries to reduce the imposition placed on the hearer by this request." (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989: 288). The speaker indicates consideration of imposition to the requestee involved in compliance with the request (Xiao-le, 2011: 109). | 'I would like to ask for an extension. Just for a few days.'  
| Cost minimiser              |                                                                                                                                            | 'I will return them in an orderly fashion'                                                                                                                                                         |  |
| 7. Apology                  | The speaker apologises for posing the request and/or for the imposition incurred.                                                                                                                       | 'I'm very sorry but I need an extension on this project.'  
|                             |                                                                                                                                            | 'I'm sorry I can't give you the lesson on Monday.'                                                                                                                                             |  |
| 8. Discourse orientation    | Opening discourse moves which serve an orientation function but do not necessarily mitigate or aggravate the request in any way.                                                                     | 'You know the seminar paper I’m supposed to be giving on the 29th...'                                                                                                                                 |  |
| orientation move            |                                                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                  |  |
| 9. Appreciation &           | The speaker shows appreciation for doing the request and/or for the imposition incurred. The speaker shows exaggerated appreciation of the requestee’s ability to comply with the request (Xiao-le, 2011: 109). | 'I would appreciate it.'  
| Confirmatory strategy/      |                                                                                                                                            | 'I would be grateful if you could help me.'                                                                                                                                                        |  |
| Sweetener                   |                                                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                  |  |
| 10. Self introduction       | The speaker’s self-introduction serves as a mitigator to the request and the imposition by highlighting the relationship or acquaintance.                                                               | 'Hey, I'm in your politics class.'                                                                                                                                                                   |  |

(Adapted from CCSARP Model in Blum-Kulka et al., 1989)
2) Internal Modifications:

According to Schauer (2009: 167) and Sifianou (1999: 157-158), internal modifications are the linguistic elements, which occur within the same head act. They are either linguistic or syntactic devices, which speakers utilise to modify the illocutionary force of their request and they can be further subcategorised as downgraders and upgraders. Based on the CCSARP coding manual (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989) downgraders fall into two classes: lexical/phrasal and syntactic downgraders. Tables 3.4 and 3.5 present the final taxonomy of internal modifications used in this research:

Types: Downgraders and Intensifiers:

Intensifiers and softeners fall under the internal modification devices. Regarding the softeners, they mitigate the force of the request by means of understaters using expressions like for a moment, for a bit, etc.; downtoners using expressions like possibly, perhaps; and hedges using expressions like kind of, sort of, etc. As for intensifiers, they aggravate the impact of the request using expressions like terribly, awfully, etc.

I. Downgraders (Softeners)

Downgraders modify request head act internally reducing its illocutionary force. These may be syntactic or lexical in nature.
## A) Lexical/Phrasal Downgraders:

### Table 3.4: Taxonomy of Lexical Downgraders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Devices</th>
<th>Illustrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Politeness marker (device)</td>
<td>'An optional element added to a request to bid for co-operative behaviour' (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989: 283)</td>
<td>'Please'</td>
<td>'Can I please have an extension on this paper?' 'Could I use you pen for a minute please?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Consultative devices</td>
<td>&quot;Expressions by means of which the speaker seeks to involve the hearer directly bidding for co-operation&quot; (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989: 283)</td>
<td>'Would you mind', 'do you think', 'would it be all right if', 'is it/would it be possible', 'do you think I could', 'is it all right'</td>
<td>'Would you mind lending me a hand?' 'Do you think I could borrow your lecture notes from yesterday?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Downtoners</td>
<td>&quot;Modifiers which are used by the speaker in order to modulate the impact his or her request is likely to have on the hearer&quot; (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989: 284)</td>
<td>'Possibly', 'perhaps', 'just', 'rather', 'maybe'</td>
<td>'Is there any way I could get an extension?' 'Will you be able to perhaps drive me?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Understaters/Hedges</td>
<td>&quot;Adverbial modifiers by means of which the speaker underrepresents the state of affairs denoted in the proposition&quot; (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989: 283). The speaker minimises the required action or object (Xiao-le, 2011: 109).</td>
<td>'A bit', 'a little', 'sort of', 'kind of'</td>
<td>'If you have a minute, could you help me with this stuff?' 'Could you tidy up a bit before I start?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Subjectivisers</td>
<td>&quot;Elements in which the speaker explicitly expresses his or her subjective opinion vis-à-vis the state of affair referred to in the proposition, thus lowering the assertive force of the request&quot; (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989: 284)</td>
<td>'I’m afraid’, ‘I wonder’, ‘I think/suppose’</td>
<td>'I wonder if you could tidy up your desk?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cajolers (to persuade somebody gently)</td>
<td>&quot;Conventionalised, addressee-oriented modifiers whose function is to make things clearer to the addressee and invite him/her to metaphorically participate in the speech act” (Sifianou, 1992: 180)</td>
<td>'You know’, ‘You see’</td>
<td>'You know I don’t have a car.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Appealers</td>
<td>&quot;Addressee-oriented elements occurring in a syntactically final position. They may signal turn availability and “are used by the speaker whenever he or she wishes to appeal to his or her hearer’s benevolent understanding” (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989: 285)</td>
<td>'Clean the table, dear, will you?... ok/right?'</td>
<td>'I need your computer to finish my assignments, okay?'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B) Syntactical Downgraders:

Table 3.5: Taxonomy of Syntactical Downgraders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Illustration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conditional structures</td>
<td>‘Could you give me an extension…’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional clause (embedded if clause)</td>
<td>‘…if it’s possible to have an extension…’ ‘…if you have time..’ ‘I would appreciate it if you left me alone.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense (past tense)</td>
<td>‘Is it all right if I asked for an extension…’ ‘I wanted to ask for a postponement.’ ‘I was wondering if I could join your study group.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect / Play-down</td>
<td>‘I was wondering if it’s possible to have an extension for the assignment.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>‘Would you mind doing the cooking tonight?’ ‘Could you do the cleaning up?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negation of preparatory condition</td>
<td>‘I don’t suppose there is any chance of an extension?’ ‘Look, excuse me, I wonder if you wouldn’t mind dropping me home?’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Upgraders (Intensifiers):

Upgraders are modifiers that are used to intensify the illocutionary force of requests. Unlike downgraders, upgraders may only be lexical and may include any of the following items, individually or in combination, as shown in Table 3.6 below:

Table 3.6: Taxonomy of Lexical Upgraders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Illustration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intensifiers</td>
<td>‘You really must open the window.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment indicators</td>
<td>‘I’m sure/certain you won’t mind giving me a lift.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expletives</td>
<td>‘You still haven’t cleaned up that bloody mess!’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time intensifiers</td>
<td>‘You’d better tidy your room right now!’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical uptoners</td>
<td>‘Clean up that mess!’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7.3. Developmental Stages of L2 Requests:

Table 3.7: Developmental Stages of L2 Requests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Pre-basic</td>
<td>Highly context dependent, no syntax</td>
<td>‘Me, no blue’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Formulaic</td>
<td>Reliance on unanalysed formulas</td>
<td>‘Let’s eat breakfast’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Unpacking</td>
<td>Formulas incorporated in productive language use, shift to conventional indirectness</td>
<td>‘Can you pass the salt, please?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Pragmatic Expansion</td>
<td>Addition of new forms to pragmalinguistic repertoire, increased use of mitigation, more complex syntax</td>
<td>‘Could I have another chocolate because my children- I have five children.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Fine-tuning</td>
<td>Fine tuning of requestive force to participants, goals and contexts</td>
<td>‘you could put some blue tack down there’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7.4. Self-reported Diaries:
The learners’ reflective blogs were analysed by the researcher-practitioner against key two-fold themes, which are the learners’ emergence of pragmatic development with their commentaries on cross-cultural pragmatic differences and their attitude towards the learning experience. In depth discernments into the learners’ attitude towards the TL itself, the material, the facilitator, and themselves as language learners with insights of the reasons for their own progress or deterioration towards ultimate success. In addition, the learners’ motivation and the affective barriers they struggled with. Learner data were analysed and codified based on perceived developments in their awareness, the pragmatic features they noticed and described, and the effectiveness of the learning materials and approaches (see Appendix C). Respondents’ biases including underreporting or over-reporting would be handled carefully. With continuous vigilance in checking the various biases, enough evidence was sought and weighed to enhance the quality of the data.

3.8. Ethical Issues:
Informed consent, privacy, confidentiality, anonymity, legality, avoiding harm and exploitation are some cardinal guidelines for research ethics that were emphasised by Hammersley and Atkinson (1995); Blaxter, Hughes and Tight (2010); as well as Hammersley and Traianou (2012). More recently, Resnik (2011) and Silverman (2016) add some general ethical principles such as honesty, objectivity, integrity, openness, and respect for intellectual property. Because human beings are involved in this study, ethical issues were considered before, during, and after the conduct of the research.
The research project was conducted after the ethics approval had been obtained from the Ethics Committee of Cardiff Metropolitan University in April 2015. All participants were informed with all required details about the study, their roles, its duration, and any possible risks. Informed voluntary consent was secured from all participants that they understand and agree to their participation in the process to which they are to be engaged according to the British Educational Research Association (BERA) (2011). Adequate planning and preparation for the study were made beforehand to ensure that participants are not detrimentally affected by the research on any level: socially, psychologically or physically. On the participants’ signature of the letters of consent, they were collected. All participants were aware of the fact that they can withdraw from the study at any moment without any academic penalties or repercussions (O'Donoghue, 2011). Furthermore, according to the BERA (2011), all participants were provided with enough information concerning data storage, how and to whom if any these data might be reported and available, including the Internet publication. Security measures were taken to secure these data as well as the participants’ confidentiality and anonymity. Their entitlement to privacy and security were recognised throughout the study. To ensure anonymity, DCTs data collection and analysis were kept under pseudonyms in all research processes (Strobl, 2000; Miles & Hubermas, 1994). According to O’Donoghue (2011), securing data and keeping them in a highly confidential manner is an ethical priority for the researcher. Therefore, the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998 (2001) were observed and fairness measures were taken into consideration throughout the study by consistently complying with the legal requirements as well as Cardiff Metropolitan University’s values and the ethics protocol.
No deleterious, detriment, or undesirable effects were assumed to any of the involved parties in the study, as a result of the conduct of this research. Opinions were examined from colleagues in the same organisation and other scholars who belong to the same field of education from other organisations, where opinions were exchanged concerning the ethical consideration of the study.

3.9. Conclusion:
This chapter discusses the research methodology adopted in the current study.

The next three chapters, Chapter 4, Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 will provide findings resulting from the process of analysis and interpretation.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: Perception MDCT

4.0. Introduction:
This chapter aims at summarising and analysing the numerical data that were elicited from the pre-and the post-intervention MDCT. In particular, it is limited to analysing the first set of data using statistical and quantitative approaches. It analyses the findings in order to explore the exact role of pragmatic instruction on the foreign language learners’ perception/recognition.

The data were collected by means of a recognition (perception) questionnaire multiple choice discourse completion task (MDCT) before and after the intervention. The MDCTs were identical in structure and situations for the pre-and the post-intervention (see Chapter 3). Originally, fifty questionnaires were administered at the pre-intervention stage and another set of fifty was distributed at the post-intervention stage, giving a total of one hundred responses. However, 5 MDCTs were discarded from the analysis, because of the respondents’ incomplete profiles (not submitting one of their diaries or missing one of their questionnaires) in addition to their irregular attendance at the intervention activities (missing more than one week). Therefore, the generated data came to a total of ninety respondents who fully participated in the study in the pre-and the post-intervention. The data were coded and organised in accordance with the research questions under investigation as well as the previously indicated instruments.

Regarding the analysis of the recognition questionnaire (MDCT), sets of scores were calculated and reported: one for the total scores, a second for the mean scores, and a third
for the standard deviations (SD). The nature of the responses of the MDCTs was binary correct/incorrect, 1/0. The results were coded as 1 for the correct response and 0 for the incorrect response. The first step was the computation of the preliminary descriptive statistics, totals, means and standard deviations, for the results of the pre-intervention and the post-intervention tasks. Next, the results were calculated and the data were entered into Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) for statistical computations (2013). Paired sample t-test analysis was applied to determine the statistical significance of the differences between the pre- and the post-intervention tasks, whether the scores differed significantly from each other. Both the descriptive statistics and inferential statistics were calculated and reported and the data were examined in terms of Research Question number 1. The categories of these data were interval.

4.1. Results:
Research Question 1: To what extent will instruction in pragmatics affect the learners’ ability to make judgments about the appropriateness of requests?

The first research question focused on the extent to which instruction in pragmatics, using awareness raising techniques, typographical input enhancement, form comparison between L1-L2, and metapragmatic explicit explanation will affect the learners’ ability to make judgments about the appropriateness of requests, measured in terms of the respondents’ ability to recognise the appropriate-inappropriate pragmatic responses in the given situations in line with NSs’ judgments.

In relation to the first research question, total scores were computed and a paired-sample t-test was applied to compare the learners’ ability to make judgments about the
appropriateness of requests before and after intervention, raising their awareness of pragmatic features of the language. Repeated measures design was employed because the study compares the same group of learners before and after the intervention. There was a significant difference between the total scores of the pre-intervention MDCT (Total = 264, M = 5.86, SD = 1.60) and the post-intervention MDCT (Total = 237, M = 7.26, SD = 1.55) condition; (t (44) = 0.000000037434, p = 0.05) (the researcher’s enhancement). According to Cohen, L., Manion and Morrison (2007: 527), t-test was used because the data were parametric and interval. The alpha level that was selected for the statistical tests conducted in this present study is 0.05. One-tailed t-test was applied yielding the result of 3.7434E-07. This means 3.743 times 10 to the power of -7, which equates to 0.000000037434 < 0.05, which is statistically significant. Running a correlation test, it can be deduced that the data are positively correlated at 0.478. These results suggest that the technique of raising awareness has an influence on the pragmatics competence of the learners who were subject to this intervention. Specifically, the results indicate that the intervention had a positive effect on the learners’ mean scores at the post-intervention MDCT which came out to be greater than those of the pre-intervention MDCT, their pragmatic competence increases. At the post-intervention stage, learners were able to recognise the appropriate-inappropriate pragmatic responses in the given situations along the lines of NSs. Thus, instruction in pragmatics, using awareness raising techniques, (that is typographical input enhancement, form comparison between L1-L2, metapragmatic explicit explanation conjoined with meaningful practice) has positively affected their ability to make judgments about the appropriateness of requests at the post-intervention stage than they were at the pre-intervention stage. Results were noted to be statistically significant at p<0.05.
4.2. Descriptive Statistics:
Means, Median, Mode, Variance and Standard Deviations were calculated for the total scores of 10 items for the 45 learners on both the pre-and post-intervention tasks. The results of this descriptive analysis for both tasks are shown in table 4.1 (below) and the decimal fractions were rounded to two significant places.

Measurement of central tendency is shown via the mean, which was found to be higher in the post-intervention MDCT compared with the pre-intervention MDCT as in: 7.26 for the latter MDCT and 5.86 for the former MDCT (see Table 4.1, emboldened). As for the point that divides the distribution of the data in half, the median in the post-intervention MDCT was determined to exceed that of the pre-intervention MDCT as in: 7 for the latter and 6 for the former. Regarding the most frequently occurring number in the data, it was identified to be the same in the pre-and the post-intervention tasks, 7 for both (see Table 4.1, shaded). Therefore, both datasets were considered unimodal, they have one mode. On comparing the mean, the median and the mode for the pre-intervention, it can be deduced that the data are neither normally nor symmetrically distributed. In other words, the scores of the pre-intervention MDCT appear to be pulled toward the left, negatively skewed to some degree, because the numerical value of the mean (mean= 5.86) is less than the median (median=6), and the numerical value of the median is less than the mode (mode=7). On the other hand, the scores of the post-intervention are slightly stretched towards the right, slightly positively skewed, where the numerical value of the mean is (mean= 7.26) greater than that of the median (median=7) and that of the mode (mode=7), typical of positively skewed data. The post-intervention data are almost normally and symmetrically distributed, however (mean=7.26, median=7, and the mode=7).
Furthermore, it needs to be stated that in the pre-intervention task almost half of the data were equal or above the mean and the median scores, 26 out of 45 respondents (58% approx.) scored around 6. However, in the post-intervention task, just under half of the respondents scored above the mean, 19 out of 45 respondents (around 42%), and around three quarters of them scored equal or above the mean, the median and the mode, 33 out of 45 respondents (almost 73%) scored 7 and above, where the mean score was higher. This indicates that almost half of the respondents scored around the median in the pre-intervention whereas around three quarters of them scored around the median in the post-intervention (see Table 4.1). This attests that the respondents’ scores tended to be higher in the post-intervention than those in the pre-intervention. It could be interpreted that the learners’ ability to notice the appropriate pragmatic forms in line with NSs improved; they were able to identify the appropriate form-function-context mappings with accuracy approximating that of NSs. As for the mean scores in the pre-intervention and the post-intervention stages, Table 4.1 demonstrates that the mean for the post-intervention is higher than that of the pre-intervention as in mean =7.26 for the latter versus mean =5.86 for the former, i.e. the average score of the post-intervention is higher than that of the pre-intervention. That is to say, the majority of the learners were able to achieve 7 or more correct answers out of 10 in the post-intervention MDCTs, whereas only half of them scored around 6 correct answers out of 10 in the pre-intervention.

Regarding the most frequent score, 7 is the score that was found to be the modal value in both the pre-intervention and the post-intervention tasks (as previously mentioned). Typical of the modal value and unaffected by outliers or extreme values, this score was found to
vary from the mean and the median on the former, yet it was identical to the median in the latter MDCT. That is to say the post-intervention MDCT mean and median scores approximated this modal value, which is not the same case for the pre-intervention scores.

With reference to the dispersion of data and their difference from the average value, SDs were calculated and they came out at SD =1.60 for the pre-intervention MDCT and SD =1.55 (Table 4.1, underlined) for the post-intervention MDCT, with smaller difference from the mean on the latter than that in the former. This indicates that the bulk of the learners moved closer to mean, scoring higher in the post-intervention than that in the pre-intervention. This attests that the respondents’ pragmatic recognition has witnessed improvement and gains after the intervention, an invariable finding on another scale.

Findings in Table 4.1 (below) reveal the total scores for MDCTs before and after the intervention, illustrating the mean, the median, the standard deviations, as well as the variance of the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDCT</th>
<th>Total scores</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-intervention MDCT</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-intervention MDCT</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in the above Table 4.1 illustrate the mean score of the learners before and after the intervention in the MDCTs. The reported findings show that the intervention seems to have resulted in the largest mean difference on the recognition measure, the MDCTs. For the same measure, the learners' mean scores have increased considerably from 5.86 before the intervention to 7.26 after the intervention. The learners performed better in the post-intervention recognition MDCT than that of the pre-intervention MDCT on all measures. This
may be attributed to a number of reasons. First, the task structure and its nature as a multiple-choice task might have facilitated the respondents’ ability to improve their own performance in the post-intervention rather than that in the pre-intervention. Another plausible reason that could be put forward for their improvement is that the respondents redid the same task, which may have given them more time and a second chance to think about their projected answers, the task became familiar to them. However, they never received a feedback regarding the pre-task that they needed to change their responses, or in what respects they need to change them. Feedback was restricted to the intervention itself and it never included the pragmatic outcome measures. Feedback was limited to the intervention including the raising-awareness activities and the metapragmatic discussions combined with the practice only that followed their pre-task. A final explanation that might be tenable is the improvement of the respondents’ pragmatic ability due to the effectiveness of the awareness raising intervention which pushed the learners to process the target features at a deeper cognitive level (Taguchi, 2015; Takahashi, 2010a; Takimoto, 2007, 2009, 2012). It seems that their ability to recognise the appropriate pragmatic forms was amenable to instruction and thus learning resulted in improved ability in recognising in/appropriate pragmatic responses. They improved significantly after the intervention and this improvement went hand in hand with the intervention, showing they were positively correlated.

Findings in Table 4.2 below show the inferential statistics of scores gained by all learners on the pre-and-post intervention MDCTs. The highest increases in scores are bordered in bold, whereas the most significant declines are in shaded sections. Possible reasons for such patterns are explored.
Table 4.2: Descriptive & Inferential Statistics of Scores Gained on Pre-and Post-Intervention MDCTs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Scores (Pre)</th>
<th>Sums</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Scores (Post)</th>
<th>Sums</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. MEAX</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2.26</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. HRAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. YLAX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. MSAX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NAAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ABAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. NSAX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3.86</td>
<td>14.89</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. FMAX</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. MTAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. DAAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. AGAX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. MHAX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. HSAX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. NEAX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. FYAX</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2.86</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. NTAX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. FHAX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. FSHAX</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. MERAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. PTAX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. HLAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. SMAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. SBAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. NOAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. MAAAX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. ASAX</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. AMAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. NBAX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. RNAX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. ZHAX</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. SFAX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. TAAAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. YAAAX</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. SEAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. ESAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. OKAX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. HHAX</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2.26</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. SHAAX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. YGAX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5.26</td>
<td>27.66</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. NHAX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. EHAX</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>32.72</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. MWAX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. RFAX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. NMXAX</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. AWAX</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>327</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings in Table 4.2 above show the scores of 31 learners out of 45 have improved in the post-intervention task in comparison to the pre-intervention one, more than half the learners. They became more aware and more sensitised to the context-based variation in language use in the post-intervention rather than what they used to be in the pre-intervention. They became more adept at recognising appropriate-inappropriate pragmatic responses in given situations, sharpening the form-function-context mappings. It was noted that 19 learners have shown 10%-20% improvement, as in 11 learners have improved with 10% and 8 learners improved with 20%. According to Table 4.2, it was highlighted (emphasized) that 12 learners improved with 30%-50%, 8 of whom improved with 30%, 3 of whom improved with 40% and 1 improved with 50%. Almost 61% of those who improved ranged between 10%-20% of progress, whereas around 39% of the advances extended to reach 30%-50%. This improvement could be attributed to many reasons. It is reasonable that learners were able to make sound pragmatic judgments by the virtue of the novelty of the experience compared with the orthodoxy of the EFL classrooms and their practices particularly in Egypt, where there are no audio-visuals or NSs’ models (Martínez-Flor, 2008). Another potential reason for this improvement may be the learners’ active heuristic skills. These skills might have been at play using their L1 intuitions, which are likely to have facilitated their performance, given that part of the intervention has focused on highlighting the positive transfer of the learners’ L1 intuitions. Awareness of the concept of requesting or the communicative event itself is likely to have facilitated their pragmatic abilities in the TL; however, they needed to be sensitised to the useful forms and structures that they already own in their L1 language system (Kasper & Rose, 2001; Kasper, 1997). They might be even unaware of what they can use, inactive knowledge. A further conceivable reason might be
that these learners might have made very good use of the awareness raising techniques employed during the intervention phase where the typographical input enhancement of the sociopragmatic parameters of the situations were highlighted, coupled with the metapragmatic explicit explanation combined with meaningful production practice (see the Methodology chapter). Kasper and Rose (2001) attest that pedagogical interventions can sensitise learners of the useful pragmatic features that they currently know and that it encourages them to use their universal or transferable L1 pragmatic knowledge in L2 contexts. There is strong evidence that pragmatics instruction in the intervention have facilitated the learners’ pragmatic knowledge.

The number of learners who witnessed an increase in their scores in the post-intervention MDCT was greater compared to those who have decreased. In other words, L2 learners who improved considerably outnumber those learners who fell back in their performance in the post-intervention MDCT, including 19 learners who undergone a moderate increase in their scores (10-20% increase). These results suggest that the intervention may have had a positive effect on these learners and that it has raised their awareness concerning the pragmatic variables of the context (form-function-context mappings) resulting in pragmatic sound judgments with reference to the given situations. Had the intervention been prolonged, it might have had more robust gains with higher intensities and percentages (further research is required to investigate such conditions).

On the other hand, two learners, HRAX and YGAX, were noted to have deteriorated in their performance in the post-intervention in comparison to the pre-intervention (shaded). Table 4.2 above shows that HRAX deteriorated by 10%, from scoring 7 pragmatically correct items
to 6 only in the post-intervention MDCT. Similarly, the same table shows that YGAX deteriorated considerably by 40%, from scoring 6 pragmatically correct items to 2 only in the post-intervention MDCT. This deterioration could be attributed to many reasons. It is reasonable that some learners were not able to make sound pragmatic judgments due to the fact that the intervention was not motivating enough for them to keep them focused and to expend the required efforts. That is why YGAX might have lacked interest in the whole experience or that she was reluctant to cooperate and respond cooperatively to the MDCT reflecting her knowledge. Another potential reason for this decline may be that it is an indication of restructuring, a pedagogical phenomenon. From a pedagogical viewpoint, this happens when new learning impels change to already internalised representations. According to information-processing models of language acquisition (McLaughlin, 1987, 1990), when information is re-organised into new categories, restructuring is thought to be at play especially where one’s cognitive ability is limited to be divided between old and new information. In other words, when acquiring additional linguistic knowledge, this new piece of knowledge should be organised in the internal language system; it should be structured which necessitates reconfiguring one’s old system in some respects. This phase of restructuring is thought to be to some extent self-organisation rather than external organisation, which may lead to a phase of destabilisation where new structures appear and others are misplaced until knowledge falls into place and learning occurs. Additional patterns became available for the learner, restructuring and destabilisation occur (Gass & Selinker, 2001; Lightbown, 1985). Finally, task difficulty might be another reason. Kim (2016) contends that some learners are likely not to perform well on certain tasks due to their own perception of the task difficulty, assuming the task to be too difficult for them.
4.2.1. Frequency Counts:

Table 4.3 below shows the frequency counts of correct recognition that were calculated in both groups. While the total number of items was 10, the total number of learners was 45.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of scores</td>
<td>Pre-intervention MDCT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of scores</td>
<td>Post-intervention MDCT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 above shows that learners’ scores could be categorised into three sets of scores: a set whose learners’ scores improved, another whose learners’ scores decreased and a third set whose learners’ scores remained stable. The number of learners who scored 8-10 at the pre-intervention MDCT was found to increase at the post-intervention MDCT. Particularly, 4 learners scored 8-10 at the pre-intervention MDCT in comparison to 19 learners at the post-intervention MDCT, almost five-fold increase. To illustrate, at the pre-intervention MDCT 2 learners scored 8, 1 participant scored 9 and 1 participant scored 10; whereas at the post-intervention MDCT, 8 learners scored 8, 9 learners scored 9 and 2 learners scored 10. As for the learners whose scores ranged from 3-6, these were computed to be 26 learners at the pre-intervention MDCT in comparison to 11 learners at the post-intervention MDCT. To illustrate, 3 learners were detected to score 3, 4 learners scored 4, 10 learners scored 5 and 9 learners scored 6. Meanwhile, at the post-intervention MDCT no participant scored 3, 1 participant scored 4, 2 learners scored 5 and 8 learners scored 6. Regarding the learners’ scores which remained unchanged, learners whose score stood at 7 as well as learners who scored 0-2. Fifteen learners scored the exact scores in the pre-and post-intervention MDCTs. To illustrate, in both MDCTs no participant scored 0 or 1, only 1 participant scored 2 at both stages and 14 learners scored 7. All in all, these
findings suggest that the learners’ range scores have increased in the post-intervention stage compared to the pre-intervention stage yielding larger numbers of learners above 7 (see below Figure 4). To illustrate, 27 learners scored below 7 at the pre-intervention MDCT, whereas 18 learners score 7 and above. Regarding the post-intervention MDCT, only 12 learners scored below 7, whereas 33 scored 7 and above. It is worth mentioning that there is no learner who opted out with no attempt at the tasks or even leaving one item with no answer. All items were attempted by all participants in both tasks. Therefore, it can be deduced that learners’ pragmatic competence has improved as reflected in their increase of scores in the post-intervention MDCT. A larger number of learners became more sensitised to the context-based variation in language use, and they became more adept at recognising appropriate-inappropriate pragmatic responses in given situations.

Figure 4 illustrates frequency distribution of the score of the pre-and the post intervention MDCTs.

![Figure 4: Frequencies of Scores in Pre-and Post-Intervention MDCTs (n=45)](image-url)
4.2.2. Description of the Shape of Distribution of Results of the Pre-Intervention Recognition Questionnaire MDCT:

Figure 5 illustrates the shape of the distribution of the data of the pre-intervention MDCT.

![Pre-intervention MDCT](image)

**Figure 5: Shape of Distribution of Data in the Pre-Intervention MDCT**

n=45

4.2.3. Description of the Shape of Distribution of Results of the Post-Intervention Recognition Questionnaire MDCT:

Figure 6 illustrates the shape of the distribution of the data of the post-intervention MDCT.

![Post-intervention MDCT](image)

**Figure 6: Shape of Distribution of Data in the Post-Intervention MDCT**

n=45
Figures 5 and 6 above display the shape of distribution of the results of the pre- and the post-intervention DCTs, respectively. The first figure (pre-intervention) shows that the majority of the learners have scored 6 and below, 27 learners out of 45 have scored either 6 (median) or below, whereas 18 learners have scored above that. Figure 6 above (post-intervention) shows 33 learners out of 45 have scored either 7 (median) or above, whereas only 11 have scored less than 7. It could be easily deduced that the majority of learners (33 in the latter compared to 18 in the former) became more aware and sensitised to the context-based variation in language use, and they became more adept at recognising appropriate-inappropriate pragmatic responses in given situations. This difference can be attributed to numerous reasons, one of which could be the intervention including the awareness raising techniques and the metapragmatic explanation with which learners were sensitised to the pragmatic aspect of the language. The learners were able to perform better and score higher on the post-intervention MDCT. Another reason that is possible is the learners’ heuristics; however, their guessing skills do not shape a climbing trend as the one the data unfold. (see previous discussion in the same chapter)

Findings in Table 4.4 below show the descriptive analysis of the MDCT items, before and after the intervention. On reviewing the data (see Appendix A), item no. 7 is revealed to be the most problematic in both the pre- and the post-intervention MDCTs; the analysis of the results of this item supports that this item was tricky for all respondents. For all items, the mean scores increased substantially in the post-intervention tasks, whereas mean scores of item no. 7 dropped from 0.53 to become 0.46. Likewise, the SD scores fell for all items except for item no. 7, which increased from 0.47 to become 0.54. In view of this
performance, it can be concluded that item no. 7 is a tricky item that might have subtly skewed the results of the learners. This item involves a conflict between the learners' native socio-cultural norms and these of the TL in which they wanted to ask a friend to let them use their personal computer to type their term paper. It is assumed that in this situation negative pragmatic transfer is at play, in which politeness, casualness, and familiarity are confused. The learners tend to value familiarity over politeness and rights according their L1 cultural norms (Al-Issa, 2003; Wierzbicka, 2003; Yu, 1999). They seem to miss the fact that politeness techniques are to be applied under all circumstance even in familiar relationships and that the requestee is under no obligation to comply with his/her request. Differences in prioritising norms and values could be a conceivable reason behind this divergence from TL conventions. To demystify these preconceived concepts about the TL socio-cultural norms, close attention should be directed to these problematic areas in which the norms of two cultures become at odds and the language learners might be caught between their L1 and the TL norms where more subjectivity might be at play (Siegal, 1996). They should be anticipated and addressed early enough in the syllabus design of the programme. However, it was decided that this item would not be discarded from the calculations of the results, as it was believed to have negligible effect on the results, if at all. Its presence among items in the data might be indicative of a challenge with which learners are faced summoning assistance in their predicament. This indicates that some items might pose difficulty to certain learners compared to others especially if their L1 cultural ethos are challenged.

Findings in Table 4.4 below display the descriptive statistics of the 10 items in the pre-intervention and the post-intervention MDCTs.
Table 4.4: Descriptive Statistics of MDCT Items in Pre-and Post-Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>MDCT Pre-intervention</th>
<th></th>
<th>MDCT Post-intervention</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=45 number of items=10 items

In addition, it could be also noted that the mean scores as well as the SD of items no. 1 and no. 7 were the same in the pre-intervention, mean= 0.53 and SD= 0.47. However, the mean and the SD of item no.1 changed to become 1 for the former and 0 for the latter in the post-intervention, unlike item no.7. This suggests that item no.1 was not problematic like item no. 7. This may be due to the fact that item no. 1 involves the relationship between a professor and a student which is a straightforward relationship and it involves minimal cultural difference between the L1 and the L2 in terms of the deference, the power, the social distance and the size of imposition of extending a set deadline for a short while. However, there was still a bit of difference in some respects, like for instance: grounding, hedging, cost minimising, mitigating the incurred imposition. To illustrate, the learners needed to identify the exact time for which the extension is required (a day later), the reason for the extension-a grounder (I've got an exam), appealing to the professor’s goodwill (I really want to put my best in this paper), etc. Using awareness raising techniques on similar situations in the intervention to pinpoint these cultural differences, it was likely that the learners were able to easily take on these nuanced details and then extend their cultural background knowledge.
on similar situations in the TL culture. This was not necessarily the case for item no. 7 in which the relationship seems more intricate between two friends, a casual and familiar relationship, which entails some differences in terms of the L1-L2 cultural background where the power issues, the social distance and the size of imposition in asking him or her to type your term paper seem to be at odds with the learners’ L1 set of norms (Al-Issa, 2003). A plausible interpretation might be that the learners might have preferred to apply their L1 cultural norms rather than to adopt the L2 cultural values and converge with the NSs’ convention. This violation is likely to be the result of a conscious decision which might have been made on the learners’ part to depart from NSs’ behaviour and assimilate with their own L1 norms willingly (Siegal, 1996) (see later discussion in Chapter 6).

4.2.4. Comparison of the Learners’ Recognition in Pre-and Post-Intervention Stages of the MDCTs:

Findings in Table 4.5 below display the correct and incorrect pragmatic recognition obtained by the learners before and after the intervention in the MDCTs among the 45 learners.

Table 4.5: Descriptive Statistics of MDCT Items at Pre-and Post-Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pre-intervention</th>
<th>Post-intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correct Pragmatic Recognition</td>
<td>Incorrect Pragmatic Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=45 number of items= 10
Findings in table 4.5 above show the descriptive statistics of the correct and incorrect pragmatic recognition obtained by the learners before and after the intervention in the MDCTs. Two score were calculated for the number of learners who have scored pragmatically appropriate items and the number who have scored pragmatically inappropriate items. It can be seen that the number of learners who had sound pragmatic recognition has increased among almost all 10 items, except for item no. 7, which has witnessed a small dip of almost 15% from 24 to 21 learners. With reference to item numbers 1 and 3, the number of learners who had correct pragmatic recognition has grown to just under double, rising from 24 to 45 learners and from 15 to 25 learners, respectively. As for items numbers 5 and 6, these have witnessed an increase of 25-20%, with a rise from 25 to 38 learners, and from 34 to 40 learners, respectively. Regarding the rest of the items, numbers 2, 4, 8, 9, and 10, there was an accretion of 10% among all five items.

Moreover, Table 4.5 above demonstrates several notable patterns with reference to the number of learners who have been able to show sound pragmatic recognition. The data reveal that there is a general trend for most of the ten items, where the number of learners who were able to show sound pragmatic recognition seems to increase. The total scores of the pragmatically appropriate items started at 267 in the pre-intervention stage and they reached 330 in the post-intervention stage with the average of 26.7 in the pre-intervention stage in comparison to 33 for the post-intervention stage. In other words, the learners’ ability to make pragmatic sound judgments seems to have improved in the post-intervention stage, from 59% of appropriateness in the pre-intervention to 73% in the post-intervention. In the same vein, the total scores of the pragmatically inappropriate items started at 183 in the pre-
intervention stage and they declined to 120 in the post-intervention stage with the average of 18.3 in the pre-intervention stage in comparison to 12 for the post-intervention stage. In other words, the learners’ inability to make sound pragmatic sound judgments seems to have decreased in the post-intervention stage, from 41% of inappropriateness in the pre-intervention to 27% in the post-intervention. However, this is not necessarily the case for item no. 7. It stands out again going against this general pattern. In fact, the number of learners who fail to recognise item no. 7 pragmatically correctly increases by almost 15%, from 21 to 24 learners.

In keeping with the general trend, the number of learners who were able to show sound pragmatic judgments for items numbers 1, 5, and 6 in the pre-intervention stage seems to have improved in the post-intervention stage. To illustrate this, the number of learners who have been able to make sound pragmatic judgments has increased with percentages ranging from 50-100%, in which 24 learners did well at the pre-intervention stage in comparison to 45 at the post-intervention stage for item no.1. Similarly, 25 learners were able to make correct pragmatic judgments in comparison to 38 learners at the post-intervention stage for item no.5. Finally, 34 learners were able to make correct pragmatic judgments at the pre-intervention stage in comparison to 40 learners at the post-intervention stage for item no.6. Along the same lines, learners’ performance at items numbers 2, 3, 4, and 8 have increased as well with percentages ranging from 10 % -50%, increasing from 33 learners at the pre-intervention to 36 learners at the post-intervention stage for item no.2, from 15 to 25 learners for item no.3, from 33 to 37 learners for item no.4, and from 28 to 32 learners for item no.8. In the same vein, items numbers 9 and 10 have witnessed a subtle
increase in the number of learners who performed well, demonstrating their sound pragmatic judgments. The number of learners whose performance has witnessed an improvement increased from 25 to 28 learners and from 26 to 28 learners, respectively. Finally, the overall results suggest that the learners’ pragmatic judgments at the post-intervention MDCT have improved compared with the pre-intervention. To illustrate this, their ability to show sound pragmatic judgments increased as reflected by the increasing number of learners who were able to make a sound judgment as opposed to the substantially dwindling number of learners who failed to make these sound judgments.

This could be attributed to many reasons (see previous discussion). It is reasonable that learners were able to make sound pragmatic judgments by the virtue of having a new experience compared with what traditionally took place in the EFL classrooms with classical teaching methods and approaches, where there are neither audio-visuals nor native speakers’ models (Martínez-Flor, 2008; Richards, 2006). Another potential reason for their improvement is the learners’ heuristic skills, which might have been at play, purposefully using their L1 intuitions, which are likely to have facilitated their performance. A further reason might be that these learners might have made a very good use of the awareness raising techniques employed during the intervention phase where the typographical input enhancement of the sociopragmatic parameters of the situations were highlighted, coupled with the metapragmatic explicit explanation combined with meaningful practice (see the Methodology chapter).
4.3. Inferential Statistics:
In order to test the significance of the difference between the pre- and the post-intervention stages results, the data were analysed using one-tailed t-tests on both (predicting that the post scores will be better than the pre-intervention ones), and the results for both are significant (see Table 4.6 below). Using the SPSS package (2013), the result in Table 4.6 was calculated and it comes out to 3.743E-07, this means 3.743 times 10 to the power of -7, which equates to 0.00000037434 < 0.05. Comparison of the total mean scores of the pre-intervention (M= 5.86, SD=1.55) and the post-intervention (M= 7.26, SD=1.60) revealed that difference was significant (t (44) = 0.00000037434, P<0.05) for the one-tailed t-test. The result was calculated using one-tailed t-test with a paired group (learners correct pragmatic recognition) and it comes out to 0.008188 < 0.05, which is statistically significant. Running a correlation on Table 4.6 unfolds that the data are positively correlated, at 0.478 (see scattergram figure 7 below). Therefore, they change in the same direction.

Figure 7 illustrates the correlation of the distribution of the data on the pre-and the post-intervention MDCT.

Figure 7: The Correlation of Data on the Pre- and Post-Intervention MDCTs
The sample means are sufficiently different to conclude that it is probably not due to random sampling error, but that this difference is due to real difference between pre-and post-intervention in the population from which these data were drawn. The differences are due to the gains that are probably an influence of the intervention rather than random chance. There is a strong enough case to argue that the intervention might have an effect on the learners’ appropriate judgments (Rugg, 2007: 72). Sampling standard error is reckoned to be small due to the big sample size, 45 participants (Trochim, 2006).

Findings in Table 4.6 display the t-test comparison of the learners’ pragmatic judgments in the pre-and the post-intervention MDCTs among the 45 learners.

Table 4.6: T-Test Comparison of the Learners’ Pragmatic Judgments in Pre-and Post-Intervention MDCTs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDCT</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-intervention</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.000000037434</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-intervention</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 above shows the paired t-test results of the comparison between the learners’ recognition scores on the pre-and the post-intervention MDCT. The results reveal that it is significant at (t (44) 0.000000037434, p<0.05) and that it positively correlates at 0.478. The mean of post-intervention MDCT group minus pre-intervention MDCT equals -1.40, with 95% confidence interval of this difference: From -1.89 to -0.91. The implication of these results is that the learners’ pragmatic judgments at the post-intervention MDCT improved compared with the pre-intervention due to the good use of the awareness raising techniques employed during the intervention phase where the typographical input enhancement of the sociopragmatic parameters of the situations were highlighted, coupled with the
metapragmatic explicit explanation conjoined with meaningful production practice. A possible explanation of these results is that the learners might have used positive transfer to their L1 intuitions, which is likely to have facilitated their performance. It is likely that the intervention might have sensitised them to the similar pragmatic features between their L1-L2 to follow meanwhile highlighting the pragmatic features, which are different between the L1-L2 in order to avoid. This technique has been embedded and enhanced in the intervention in one of the intervention activities (see Appendix E).

4.3.1. Variance in the Data in the Pre-and Post- Intervention Questionnaires:
As shown in Table 4.7 below, the percentage of change that occurred at its highest is the rise of the scores of the respondents in the range of 10%-20% (19 out of 45 respondents, almost 42% of the respondents). The frequency of this change was followed by either the respondents’ stagnation or their improvement in the range of 30%-40%, with 11 respondents for each variance, roughly 24% of the sample size. Finally, the outliers of these results came out equally at 1, with only one respondent for each at 50% increase, or 10% decrease, or 40% decrease.

Table 4.7: Percentage of Variance and the Number of Learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>No. of learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% -20% variance rise</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% -40% variance rise</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% variance rise</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% variance decline</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% variance decline</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=45

These findings suggest that the majority of the respondents improved their scores by a 10%-20% rise, with a tendency for improvement in their ability to recognise sound pragmatic appropriateness. It is worth mentioning that the pattern of improvement was tailed by 12
learners whose scores improved by 30%-40%. Another noteworthy point is that there was only one case of substantial increase in the respondents’ performance with, 50% increase, making a total of 31 learners who increased substantially. This indicates that using this intervention the respondents’ pragmatic competence progresses considerably and consistently, stability of gains could be inferred. It may suggest that the intervention may need to be further extended in duration, an element that is worth further examination. The findings show that the learners’ tendency to increase is 68.8% in their pragmatic recognition in comparison to a periphery of learners who were limited to 4.4%, who fell back in their pragmatic recognition, only 2 respondents out of 45. No significant deterioration was detected with respect to their scores, i.e. only one participant out of the two fell back in her performance by 40%, which might be an idiosyncratic case of lack of interest and immaturity or restructuring as alluded to by her diary entries and WDCT performance (see Chapters 6 and 5). There is also the likelihood of its being random chance. YGAX is a case that will be further studied in the coming two chapters. As for the other learner, HRAX fell back by only 10%. It was surmised that her excessive focus on native-like production and accurate pronunciation might have limited the development of her pragmatic competence. It seems to have distracted her attention and noticing from the target pragmatic features occupying her full attention with only the structural elements of the TL. Allocating her attention on pronunciation, as a prioritised learning target according to her agenda, whereas the facilitator’s priority was on the target pragmatic features could have distracted the learner’s full attention, conflict of agendas. Her learning expectations and objectives together with the perceptual salience of the target pragmatic features might have undermined her pragmatic development and success. It can be assumed that HRAX poses a quintessential case of
agendas conflict, where the learner’s agenda conflicts forcibly with the teacher’s deterring the learner from achieving acquisitional gains in any scheme (Bernaus & Gardner, 2008).

4.4. Summary of the Instructional Effects on the Learners’ Recognition:
The major findings of the present cross-sectional study exploring the role of instruction in pragmatics on Egyptian EFL learners’ realisation of request as a speech act, reflecting their pragmatic competence and knowledge, in terms of their recognition are as follows:

a. The results reveal that the learners’ mean scores have increased considerably from 5.86 before the intervention to 7.26 after the intervention and that this difference was statistically significant. The learners performed better in the post-intervention recognition MDCT than that of the pre-intervention MDCT. The improvement of the respondents’ pragmatic ability is believed to be due to the effectiveness of the awareness raising intervention.

b. The results showed that the number of learners whose scores have witnessed a considerable increase in the post-intervention MDCT are greater in number compared to those who have decreased, as in, 33 learners improved considerably scoring 7 or above, whereas only 18 learners scored 7 or above in the pre-intervention. It seems that a larger number of learners became more sensitised to the context-based variation in language use (form-function-context mappings), recognising appropriate-inappropriate pragmatic responses in given situations.

c. The results revealed that item no. 7 (see Appendix A) is the most problematic in both the pre-and the post-intervention MDCTs. It was believed to have negligible effect on the results, if any, which is why it was decided that this item would not be discarded from the calculations of the results.
d. The results show that the majority of the learners were able to show sound pragmatic recognition on almost all ten items of the post-intervention MDCT. The total scores of the pragmatically appropriate items started at 267 in the pre-intervention stage and they reached 330 in the post-intervention stage. Hence, it could be inferred that the learners’ ability to make pragmatic sound judgments seems to have improved in the post-intervention stage, with 73% increase in their appropriate pragmatic recognition accuracy in the post-intervention compared with 59% on the former task.

e. Finally and most importantly, running a paired t-test, the results showed that the comparison between the learners’ recognition scores on the pre-and the post-intervention MDCT reveal that it is significant at (t (44) 0.000000037434, p<0.05) and that it positively correlates at 0.478. The results lend support to the superiority of the learners’ post-intervention performance over the pre-intervention after benefiting from the intervention phase.

These results suggest that the learners’ pragmatic judgments at the post-intervention MDCT improved compared with the pre-intervention due to the good use of the awareness raising techniques employed during the intervention phase. These results indicate that learning has occurred. There is change in the learners’ pragmatic competence or knowledge from the pre-instruction to the post-instruction, where the participants and the teacher-researcher worked together to effect change.
4.5. Other Research:
As for prior research, the current study results seem to be in line with other researchers’ and studies’ findings. Rajabia et al. (2015: 231) investigated the effect of explicit pragmatic instruction on appropriate performance of request speech act across two proficiency levels with reference to two social variables of status and distance. Comparable to this present study in design and context, they administered a pre-intervention test, and a post-intervention one with experimental and control groups on 73 EFL learners in both intermediate and advanced levels. With more than double the duration of this present study, they provided instruction in 25 sessions. They employed measurement tasks and analysis techniques parallel to this study. Their data were collected using a DCT consisting of 4 request situations, as the measuring instrument of the instructional gains. They analysed their data using SPSS (t-test) which they conducted on two steps: the data were analysed for pragmatic appropriateness using rating 5-point Likert scale that was based on CCSARP Coding Scheme proposed by Blum- Kulka et al. (1989) and then they were entered on SPSS version 20 to come up with inferential statistics, t-test. With comparable aims to this present research, that study aimed at investigating the relationship between explicit instruction of several strategies of request speech act on the EFL students’ pragmatics competence in terms of appropriateness of performing requestive acts in the Iranian context. The results revealed that there was a significant difference in the experimental group students’ knowledge between the pre-and the post-tests, while this was not the case with control group where no significant change was reported. This implies that pragmatic knowledge of experimental group improved after intervention. These results lend support to explicit instruction and that it is considered a facilitative tool to develop L2 learners' pragmatic competence, which complies with the previously mentioned results. Regarding
the theoretical implications, this outcome together with the results of the present research suggest the necessity of incorporating consciousness-raising activities in the classroom, and that explicit instruction of pragmatic knowledge is more beneficial to the realisation of request in the TL.

Another study that could be compared to this present research is that of Derakhshan and Eslami (2015) in which the effect of consciousness-raising video-driven prompts on the pragmatic development of request and apology was examined using 60 Persian, upper-intermediate learners. Likewise, Derakhshan and Eslami’s study employed video-driven prompts similar to the video-enhanced materials that were employed this present research. They randomly assigned their learners in three groups: discussion, role-play, and interactive translation groups. Data were elicited using MDCT adapted from Liu’s (2007) study in a pre-test, post-test design. The results lend support to benefit from all three types of instruction, discussion, role-play, and interactive translation; however, the discussion group outperformed all groups on the Scheffe test (see Chapter 2 for further details). Similar to the statistical results of this present study, Derakhshan and Eslami’s quantitative results revealed that instruction has had an effect on the learners’ pragmatic development with a total mean score of the three groups in the post-test higher than that of the pre-test. The mean of the discussion group was the highest, followed by the interactive translation group then finally, the role-play group. Similar to this present study, the inferential statistics were calculated to find out if the difference between the pre-and the post-test which was significantly different using, t-test. Results showed that it was significantly different at p<0.05, indicating that the video-driven prompts led to the development of ILP.
With several differences including the multiplicity of the target pragmatic features under investigation and the methods of instruction, another study that came up with similar findings as those of this present research is the study Eslami-Rasekh et al. (2004). That study examined the effect of explicit metapragmatic instruction on the speech act comprehension of advanced EFL students. Unlike this present research which focused on a single pragmatic feature, that study targeted multiple pragmatic features: requesting, apologising, and complaining. Using a different method of instruction, this present research employed multiple pragmatic-oriented tasks to promote the learning of the targeted speech acts including teacher-fronted discussions, cooperative grouping, and role plays. Employing a design similar to the one employed in this present research, Eslami-Rasekh, Z. et al. used pre-test-post-test design though, they used a control group as well. The participants of that study were Iranian undergraduate students in EFL context. A group of American students were used to provide the baseline for that study. A multiple choice pragmatic comprehension test was devised as the instructional outcome measure to assess the effect of instruction on the pragmatic comprehension of the participants. The results revealed that participants’ speech act comprehension improved significantly. These outcomes comply with the findings of this present study as well. They indicate that pragmatic competence is not impenetrable to instruction even in EFL settings (see Chapter 2 for further details).

**4.6. Conclusion:**
One of the aims of the current research was to examine the role of instruction in pragmatics on the learners’ recognition of when an utterance is or is not pragmatically at odds with the TL expectations and conventions. The results suggest that instruction in pragmatics plays a facilitative role and that it contributes to the learners’ ability to make sound pragmatic
judgments effectively improving their ability to recognise pragmatically appropriate utterances within input. As for the learners’ production, the second perspective of the learners’ language development, and another aim for this present study, the following chapter plans to analyse the learners’ production on the WDCT using the coding framework of Blum-Kulka et al. (1989).
CHAPTER 5
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: Production WDCT

5.0. Introduction:
Turning to the second section of the data analysis, this chapter aims to analyse the second set of data (pre-and post-intervention WDCT) using qualitative approaches. It is limited to analysing the findings of this dataset in order to explore the exact role of pragmatic instruction on the foreign language learners’ production: pragmalinguistically and sociopragmatically.

The data examined in this chapter were collected by means of a production questionnaire, written discourse completion task questionnaires (WDCT) before and after the intervention. The WDCTs were identical in structure and situations for the pre- and the post-intervention (see Chapter 3). Originally, fifty questionnaires were administered at the pre-intervention stage and another set of fifty was distributed at the post-intervention stage, giving a total of one hundred responses. However, the obtained data came to a total of ninety respondents who fully participated in the study (see previously mentioned reasons). The data were sifted, codified and organised in accordance with the research questions under investigation as well as the previously mentioned instruments. This chapter analyses the results in order to explore the exact role of pragmatic instruction on the foreign language learners’ production. It also investigates the learners’ ability to make appropriate and correct requests based on the relevant contextual cues and that matches those of NSs.

The analysis of the data was conducted via a pre-determined framework, i.e. they were deductively analysed by imposing a structured framework. This approach to the data
was fairly easy and straightforward to follow. This framework was previously validated and employed by Alcón-Soler, Martínez-Flor, and Safont-Jordà (2005), by Taguchi (2006) and they were all based on the significant typology of Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) in their seminal study CCSARP. The adopted coding framework is also adapted from Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) CCSARP; however, it was more refined by adding three additional features to the original framework which were motivated by Taguchi (2006). This fine-grained 12-fold framework can enhance and fine-tune the linguistic analysis of the learners’ production. It was employed purposefully to assign special attention to the peripheral modification moves and devices that accompany the head act in the pre- and the post-head act positions. Motivated by an aspiration to understand the situation (EFL context) and change the practice, the teacher-researcher sought to probe into the learners’ performance using the most fine-grained framework. She critically evaluated their pragmatic competence production to act responsively.

**Research Question 2a:** To what extent will instruction in pragmatics affect the learners’ performance of target-like requests that are pragmalinguistically appropriate?

**Research question 2b:** To what extent will the instruction in pragmatics affect the learners’ performance of target-like production of requests that are sociopragmatically appropriate?

In the following section, a sample of the typical examples of requests made by learners from the pre- and the post-intervention are discussed as well as their analyses. The data were managed using three techniques: annotation, labelling, and summarisation.
5.1. Discussion of the Results of the Pre-and Post-Intervention WDCTs:
In this written task, more time was available for learners to think and reflect on their strategies. Due to the large size of the data after analysing the WDCT, including returns of both the pre-and the post-intervention, it was decided that a focused sample should be pulled out of the full-sized data. This decision was made to ensure that the size of data should be manageable and that the analysed data were representative of the full-fledged sample. Driven by the numerically yielded data from the first instrument, the MDCT (Chapter 4), it was observed that the data involved three main segments: learners who improved at different percentages ranging from 10%-50%, and others who made no change, and finally only 2 learners who declined one at 10% and another at 40%. The first segment accounted for 31 learners out of the total number of learners 45, accounting for almost 68% of the data; whereas the second segment amounted to 12 learners, around 28%, and finally the third segment involved 2 learners only, roughly 4%. The focused sample of the WDCT was informed by the yielded data segmentation of the MDCT. This sample includes 5 learners and it could be broken down into outliers, which indexed the two extremes of performance coming out to 3 learners the best and the worst performance, as well as 2 from the rest with 1 participant representing each category: 1 participant at 30%-40% and 1 participant at zero change.
5.2. Sample participants:

1. Participant FYAX

FYAX represents the outlier segment, one of the best performance participants. On analysing the performance of FYAX, there were indications that her production has experienced considerable change (researcher enhancement) from the pre-intervention phase on the WDCT to the post-intervention one. This can be detected in several features. Most notably is the emergence of cost-minimisers, hedging and tentativeness in some situations in the post-intervention stage, aspects that were totally absent from the pre-intervention. She demonstrated more hedging giving more room for her interlocutors either to accept and comply with her request, or to reject it altogether. This is a strategy that is inconsistent with the learner's L1 norms, an emerging feature in the learner's ILP system. For instance, 'do you want to be responsible for... if yes, can you please...' 'if you have the time, can you...' and so on. Another noteworthy feature is that she tended to utilise an array of politeness supporting modification devices pre-within-and post-head act, as either external or internal devices, showing a sincere desire to maintain cordial relationships with her interlocutors. She utilised external devices such as: pre-head act modification devices like the use of alerter to grab the interlocutor's attention, mitigated-preparatory expressions to prepare her interlocutor for the ensuing request, disarming to indicate awareness of potential offense, grounding to give reasons for her request, and pre-commitment to try to get others to commit. She also employed complimenting to sweeten her request, apology to downsize the imposition incurred or for posing a request altogether, cost-minimiser and hedging to get the interlocutor to cooperate, and discourse orientation to prepare the interlocutor for the coming request. In addition, she incorporated internal modification devices, lexical modification devices as in: politeness markers to show gratitude for the
projected complying with the request, cajolers to check availability, consultative markers to
seek cooperation, downtoners to lower the assertive voice of the request, as well as few
lexical upgraders like her use of an intensifier to show the urgency of her request. Finally,
she incorporated a combination of syntactical internal modification devices as in her use of
conditional clauses to lower the assertive voice and infer tentativeness, interrogatives to
impart freedom of action to the interlocutor, and the past tense to communicate distance,
detachment and remoteness from the request. Past tense maker is a syntactical
downgrader that developed in some of her situations (situations nos. 3,4,5, & 8),
nonetheless it is a feature that was never used in the pre-intervention WDCT.

It appears that her pragmalinguistic repertoire is still developing, missing some native-like
features, such as her lack of the use of strong hinting as a requestive strategy, and the
absence of few modification devices such as the promise of reward to sweeten the
imposition incurred and the appreciation to show gratitude in some situations such as that of
situations nos. 6 and 8, respectively. In situation no.6, it seems that she failed to identify the
importance of SD as a decisive factor in determining the pragmalinguistic expressions to be
employed. She misinterpreted the SD between herself and her classmate: thinking that the
requestee is socially obliged to comply with her request and react positively offering her a
lift, in which she never incorporated a mitigating grounder resulting in a more or less
forceful, unadorned request. To illustrate, ‘are you going home? If yes...’. The expression
that she used in the post-intervention in this situation are grammatically precise,
comprehensible yet fairly less appropriate than what NSs would employ. In fact, her request
realisation in situation no. 6 is likely to be considered an instance of pragmatic failure. One
A plausible reason for FYAX’s divergence from the NSs’ norms is likely to be her application of her L1 norms to a situation in which the TL norms were inconsistent with her L1 norms. She negatively transferred her own L1 sociocultural norms yielding this terse request (Al-Issa, 2003; Wierzbicka, 2003; Yu, 1999). It is possible that FYAX miscalculated the contextual cues relevant to the situation or that she purposefully diverted from the NSs’ norms. According to Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1986: 168), pragmatic failure occurs “whenever a speaker fails to live up to his interlocutor’s expectations...” of socioculturally appropriate convention according the TL norms. Apart from these two cases, closer inspection reveals that her production seems likely to become perfectly aligned with NSs’ production in almost all situations except for situations nos. 6 and 8.

With reference to her pre-intervention WDCT, it could be easily noted that her production was enough to get the message across marred with a few instances of possible pragmatic difficulties. It was a complex enough to avoid major communication breakdown but not impermeable to some social tensions. She employed pre- and within-head act modification devices, but no post-head act devices. She was able to employ a few external and internal modification tools with variable command, yet the range of these devices was rather restricted. She is grappling with her underdeveloped pragmatic competence as reflected in her slightly forceful directives, which are likely to lead to serious social difficulties unless she applies strategies to improve her pragmalinguistic competence. Her awareness had to be raised regarding combinations of ‘when can I come to talk to you?’ in addressing her very busy tutor which may lead to serious results, unless it is softened by a disarmer.
This marks FYAX’s limited pragmatic competence before the intervention, compared with her reasonably advanced abilities after the intervention.

A. Pre-head Act:

In the pre-intervention WDCT, FYAX opened her requests in half of the situations with no verbal call for attention to alert the interlocutors to the ensuing request. She employed mitigated-preparatory expressions including grounders, apologies in four situations and she utilised attention getters paired with mitigated-preparatory expressions in the other half of the situations. On comparing her production to that of NSs, she failed to produce utterances similar to theirs in situations nos. 1, 2, 6 and 8. Her reduced use of attention getting devices in the pre-head act in situations nos. 3, 4, 5 and 7 indicates that she possesses some awareness of the need to alert the interlocutor. Nevertheless, she applied it in only half of the situations which suggests that she has variable command of this knowledge and its context of application. On a different level, no situation was free from at least one of these devices, which reflects acceptable level of pragmalinguistic awareness on the learner’s part even before the intervention. This might be a reason for her considerable development post-intervention, 50% increase on the MDCT. Hence, it seems that her pragmalinguistic ability is just above the average level, but it has not fully developed to that extent that she is able to employ it resourcefully, with flexibly and precision.

Closer inspection of the data reveals that FYAX’s production of the pre-head act strategies in the pre-intervention had some significant features. To start with, she used mitigated-preparatory expression, with no alerters, mostly in the situations in which she assumed high level of familiarity or power where she deemed no big social distance, as in situations nos. 1,
2, and 8. She assumed casual and familiar relationship when asking her younger brother to close the window where no high stake is involved and thus no mitigation devices are required. Being a sibling and the difference in age might be the reasons why she sought minimal modification devices, though her speech act realisation does not match that of NSs.

In the same situation in the baseline data, NSs were noticed to use conventionally indirect strategies, with a more or less elaborate structure in which politeness was assumed in spite of the familiarity and the low size of imposition. In the same vein, in situation no. 2, where the learner was addressing her classmate while preparing a group presentation, and it is the participant’s responsibility to assign roles, she assumed high power, to be a key parameter at play. Unlike NSs, she directly addressed her classmate with no use of alerters producing an inappropriate and brusque response. Therefore, the learner’s production starting with mitigated-preparatory expression straight away and including a few modification devices does not meet that of NSs. Further evidence for the disparity of learner’s production from that of the NSs could be identified in situation no. 6, in which she was asking for a lift from a classmate who lives in the same area. She started her request with no alerter assuming familiarity to the interlocutors and their obligation to react positively. It could be argued that the participant seems to have defaulted on her L1 cultural social norms and applied them to the foreign language context in which asking someone for a lift is no big imposition, and thus entails no extensive modification. Along the same lines of the negative transfer of one’s cultural social norms, in situation no. 8, where the president of a university had to ask a skilful student to fix his broken computer, she started her request with the mitigated-preparatory expression paired with a grounder straight away. She tended not to use attention getter or discourse orientation but rather ‘I have a problem with my computer’. She
seems to have held and applied stereotypical conjectures of power over students, assuming them to be subject to the president’s will with no sensitivity to their rights, producing ‘I need it urgently’. This production is unlike NSs who employed more mild and strong hinting rather than an unmitigated direct request. However, hedging as a strategy was not used as it is not a common feature of politeness in the L1; in fact, it is viewed as evasiveness and crookedness.

With reference to FYAX’s post-intervention, her pre-head act strategies production improved considerably. Unlike her pre-intervention, she opened six of her requests with a verbal call of attention as in ‘excuse me’ ‘sorry for interruption’ ‘good morning’ ‘hi’. She developed awareness of the importance of using alerters to gain the interlocutors’ attention for the ensuing requests. She employed a wide range of external modification devices in the pre-head act stage with combinations such as: (mitigated-preparatory expression+ grounder), (mitigated-preparatory expression + compliment), (alerter+ disarmer +grounder), (alerter+ discourse orientation+ disarmer+ cajoler+ grounder), (alerter +apology +hedging), (mitigated-preparatory expressions+ politeness maker +checking availability) and (alerter+ mitigated-preparatory expressions+ compliment+ grounder +intensifier). She used an array of modification devices: external and internal downgrading and upgrading. She aptly employed these tools to downplay the potential infringement and maintain cordial relationships with the interlocutors. Similar to NSs and unlike her use in the pre-intervention, she used compliments in situations nos. 2 and 8. She used them appropriately where a compliment is required to encourage the interlocutors to cooperate, i.e. praise and flatter, as in, ‘I know you are very good with computers’ in situation no.2 and ‘I have heard you are
very skilful in fixing computers’ in situation no. 8. This indicates that her sociopragmatic competence is developing, in which her evaluation of SD between her and her classmate started to change and develop towards the TL values. She also employed a disarmer in situations nos. 3 and 4, similar to NSs, where there is the potential of a refusal, a signal that her competence is expanding becoming more resourceful and enterprising. These situations involved significant imposition and the requester had to show some awareness of the possible refusal as in, ‘I know you are so busy’ and ‘the course was already closed and as you know’. Furthermore, she utilised a grounder in situations nos. 1, 3, 4 and 8 as in, ‘because I have a test’ ‘I wanted to discuss my essay’ ‘since it will make me graduate’, ‘because I need it urgently’. Unlike NSs, grounders were absent from situations nos. 2, 5 and 6 where they seemed important, however. She diverged from NSs in these situations reflecting her struggle with the flexibility of use of some devices, an indication of her underdeveloped sociopragmatic competence. It is likely that FYAX is still unable to recognise that in situations where she needs to bring her interlocutors to react positively, she needs to provide them with a reason to comply. She needs to convince her classmate in situation no. 2 why she has to take the responsibility of preparing the power point, and in situation no. 6 to give her a lift, and finally in situation no. 5 she needs to get a student she does not know well to cooperate and fulfil her request, direct her to the Engineering building. The lack of flexibility and precision of some modification devices, as well as their misplacement in some cases reflect on her still developing competence.

Her post-intervention showed improvement in her refined and consistent assignment of either attention getters, her employment of more elaborate structures involving a wide range of modification devices. Diverging from her L1 norms, she used cost-minimisers, hedgers,
and tentativeness in many situations. In general, she seems to have developed her pragmatic competence in the sense that she became more pragmalinguistically competent possessing a wide range of modification devices at her disposal, with improved sociopragmatic competence in her high standard appropriate assignment of these devices according to the situational cues. Her use of a gamut of modification devices indicate that she has got a firm grip of the required linguistic resources and knowledge. The range of devices reflects wider knowledge and better control over her linguistic forms, target pragmatic features, and the functional meaning of the utterances. The intervention directed her attention the linguistic forms and their functional meaning, which enabled her to integrate them in this production, form, function and, context mappings.

B. Head Act:

In her pre-intervention production task, she mostly used interrogative as in, ‘can you…’ in almost five situations as well as ‘do you mind+ gerund’ ‘I just wanted to ask for+ noun’ and ‘would it be a problem if you + verb’. It seems that she was not able to employ the required parameters in determining the pragmalinguistic expression to use. It is clear that she lacks precision of use, there are hardly informed decisions driven by firm knowledge of the TL socio-cultural norms. To illustrate, she employed the most sophisticated expressions in no high stake situations as these of 2, 5 and 6, where she was addressing her classmates. Employing this range of linguistic expressions reveals that her pragmalinguistic ability is not lacking; however, it lacks flexibility and precision. There seems to be some knowledge gap in her sociopragmatic competence which inform her appropriate assignment of the form-meaning-contexts mappings, according to the TL contextual parameters. For instance, NSs
used no interrogatives in situation no. 2 as in: ‘I was thinking may be you want to do...’, whereas FYAX realised her request using interrogative ‘do you mind+ gerund’. She directly stated her request where she was supposed to imply it. Similarly, NSs employed ‘I was hoping you might have the time to...’ or ‘I would find it really helpful to...’ in situation no.3, in which the learner utilised ‘can I come to talk to you about it?’. In general, this suggests that her pragmalinguistic resources before the intervention were to some extent rich; however, she was unable to activate this linguistic repertoire by extending its range of resources, applying it with more flexibility. Therefore, she may benefit from the intervention as per her sociopragmatic competence, achieving more flexibility and higher levels of precision.

In her post-intervention production task, she maintained her use of interrogative expressions in most of the situations; however, TL situational features supported some improvement. For example, she used suggestion in situation no.2, and hinting in situation no.8. The emergence of both suggestion and hinting indicates that new linguistic expressions are evolving apart from unanalysed formulaic expressions of ‘can you...’ or ‘would you mind...’, where there is improved tentativeness and hedging. It appears that FYAX is moving more closely towards NSs’ linguistic patterns employing complex embedded sentence structures intertwined with more hedging. The mitigated imperative was also used in situation no. 1 as in ‘so please close the window’ rather than the use of interrogative reveals more flexibility on the part of the learner in which she is able to depart from the classical unanalysed formulaic expressions. It could be argued that she relied on the mitigated direct directive in this situation where familiarity is assumed and no high stake is involved. However, she aptly managed to mitigate the assertive voice inferred by the use of the imperative using a
mitigated-preparatory, grounder, politeness marker as pre-head act modification devices. This may relate to a more developed sociopragmatic competence in which she felt comfortable using a mitigated direct directive paired with internal lexical downtoners to soften the request. Alternatives were used based on the learner’s evaluation of the situations revealing more flexibility of use. The learner’s production appears to be moving close to NSs’ production of head acts. It can be clearly stated that NSs used interrogative expressions, suggestions, as well as hinting; however, they tended to temper them to be more hedging and tentative, more indirect as in ‘do you think you could…’ rather than ‘can you/I…’. To some extent, she has developed her foreign language pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic competences; however, she has yet to manage her ability to hedge more to sound more native-like. She used suggestions and mild hinting in her head acts in situations nos. 2 and 8, which is tightly aligned with NSs’ production showing very encouraging development in her pragmalinguistic pragmatic knowledge. She employed suggestion in the former and hinting in the latter which suggests to a firmer grip of her sociopragmatic competence. One interpretation to this evolving pattern could be that the head act, by definition, is the ‘minimal unit which can realise a request; it is the core of the request sequence’ (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989). Therefore, it is the most noticed and thus it is the element that receives most of the attention and thus most of the progress in learning is attached to it. Another possible interpretation of their relative ease of learning of the head acts is the fact that they are fixed, syntactic chunks; they might appear independently by themselves without modification or mitigation of request. Thus, head acts are salient enough to bestow change at an early stage in the development of the learner’s pragmatic
competence. This development relates to Schmidt’s Noticing Hypothesis (1993, 1995, 2001) where noticing marks what is amenable to learning.

On closely analysing the data on the post-intervention production task, they revealed that FYAX’s responses became more elaborate in the sense that the head act involved a combination of external and internal modification devices. In keeping with NSs’ production, she employed politeness markers, consultative makers seeking cooperation, conditional structures, downtoners, cost-minimisers, and hedging as in: ‘would you mind...’ ‘I just wanted to ask...’ and if-clause conditional, past tense as well as interrogative as in ‘if you have time, can you please help me’ ‘would it be a problem if you gave me...’ and do you want to be...’. Showing her developing sociopragmatic competence, she employed the lexical downgrader ‘please’ wisely as in situations nos. 4, 6 and 7 rather than among all situations with no sensitivity to the situational features, as frequent as NNSs do. It can be argued that her ILP is developing in the sense that she is adhering to NSs’ usage (NNSs were noted to overuse ‘please’ across the board, a classical overgeneralisation) (see Ishihara & Cohen, A., 2014). The emergence of the use of the past tense is another feature that can be highlighted which shows that the learner started to develop an awareness of the use of past tense as a powerful tool to mitigate requests showing detachment and remoteness, a feature that is widely used by NSs.

C. Post-head Act:

Regarding the post-head act strategies, FYAX in her pre-intervention concluded her request with hardly any post head-acts except for situation no. 2, where she used a subjectiver ‘I am
sure you will do something good’. In this situation, she seems to be aware of the importance of opinion expressions in lowering the assertive voice of the request in an attempt to downplay the force of the request using a lexical downgrading move. However, no expressions of appreciation, gratitude, politeness markers, wrap up, farewell, or religious formula were employed similar to those used by NSs as a post-head act, as in ‘I’d appreciate your help’ ‘thank you’ ‘any help would be much appreciated’ please’ ‘will you?’.

With respect to the post-intervention, she developed the ability to use post head-act modification strategies like those employed by NSs such as the intensifier ‘urgently’, the politeness marker ‘please’, and the grounder ‘because I need it urgently’. However, these strategies were not widely used, they were used in just under half of the situations nos. 3, 7 and 8, respectively. This limited use reveals her limited pragmalinguistic ability with reference to the use of post-head acts to downplay the force of the request. In general, FYAX was different from NSs in her underuse of post-head act devices. It appears that her post-head act as a discourse structure is yet to be noticed as an essential component in the request realisation and thus it is likely to develop in the future. It could be argued that her full attention was given to the head act and the pre-head in which progress was achieved, whereas the post-head act received little attention instead.

D. Types of Strategies:

Regarding the types of strategies, FYAX applied mostly conventionally indirect strategies in most of the situations on the pre-intervention WDCT using interrogatives combined with limited external and internal modification devices. She employed relatively transparent strategies: neither direct, nor unconventionally indirect strategies. This reveals that her
pragmatic knowledge is limited as far as the range of strategies that might be used to
downplay the force of the requests.
Regarding her post-intervention responses, she seems to have employed the whole variety
of strategies: direct, conventionally-indirect, and non-conventionally-indirect. She has
basically maintained her use of conventionally indirect strategies in most of the situations
but for situations nos. 1 and 8, in which she resorted to using more direct strategies in the
former and she relied on hinting and hedging in the latter. To illustrate, she used the
mitigated imperative highlighting (+P -SI -SD) in asking her younger brother to close the
window as in ‘please close the window’, parallel to some NSs. Similarly, she was found to
use non-conventionally indirect strategy as in hinting in situation no.8, typical to NSs. It can
be claimed that FYAX’s production improved in the sense that she became able to utilise a
wide range of strategies embracing extensive politeness supporting moves. She ranged
from relatively transparent to extremely opaque utterances in realising her requests. This
reveals that her pragmatic knowledge is developing substantially as far as the range of
strategies at her disposal similar to those of NSs.

E. Stages of L2 Request Development:
On assigning FYAX to stages of L2 request development (Achiba, 2003 & Ellis, 1992, cited
in Kasper & Rose, 2002: 140), it can be concluded that she has developed from stage 4, the
pragmatic expansion stage, to stage 5, the fine-tuning stage. She has improved from the
pragmatic expansion stage to using aspects of the fine-tuning stage. For instance, she
shifted from using elaborate mitigation devices to include a repertoire of new
pragmalinguistic forms such as: ‘would you mind’ ‘may I’ ‘do you want to’, in addition to her
use of more complex structures, as in the use of if-conditional clause, past tense and
interrogative. She moved from the use of conventionally indirect requests in which she relied basically on expanded structures embracing mitigating expressions to incorporate more fine tuning to the requestive force, goals, interlocutors and context. She integrated many linguistic expressions in the pre-intervention with no discernment of the learners’ goals and context, which were further fostered in the post-intervention.

Comparing the previously mentioned findings of the MDCT recognition task, FYAX improved by almost 50%, scoring 8 out of 10 in the post-intervention test compared with 3 out 10 in the pre-test. These findings are not really aligned with her performance on the WDCT. It could be argued that her performance on the pre-intervention WDCT is not as bad as (3 out of 10) on the pre-intervention MDCT; in fact, her production surpassed her recognition substantially. It seems that her recognition on the pre-intervention MDCT lagged behind in an instance that contradicts research findings (see previous discussion on recognition preceding production). This outcome may be attributed to the robustness of her learning which enabled her to deal with highly demanding tasks WDCT, more easily than the MDCT, which does not require her complete pragmatic knowledge. The less demanding nature of the MDCT task in the pre-intervention might have caused her to out in less effort resulting in fewer gains. Yet, the increasing trend that was seen in her post-intervention MDCT is in correspondence to that in her post-intervention WDCT. It seems that her post-intervention contribution in both tasks outperformed her pre-intervention tasks. She demonstrated better performance in most respects, 8 out of 10 on the MDCT as well as close movement towards NS linguistic patterns on the WDCT, with improved pre-head and head act strategies, higher levels of indirectness and tentativeness as well as moving to stage five of L2 request development.
2. Participant MSAX

MSAX represents the 30%-40% segment, one of the generally appropriate performance participants. On analysing the performance of MSAX, it seems that her production has undergone moderate change from the pre-intervention stage on the WDCT to post-intervention. This can be notably detected in several features in her production. Her production on the pre-intervention WDCT demonstrated very little use of any verbal call for attention in almost seven situations except for situation no. 2. Another feature on her performance is that she incorporated ‘can you...’ formula into her production in just above half of the situations with no sensitivity to the contextual differences between situations based on the circumstantial parameters. Also worthy of note is her consistent use of (because + NP) supporting almost half of her requests with grounders to mitigate them. It could be argued that MSAX had limited pragmalinguistic repertoire besides her scant awareness regarding the potential tension that may result from face threatening requests. This awareness might have pushed her to embed a limited range of mitigating expressions into her requests. However, her command of these few modification devices tended to be with reduced variety and limited flexibility resulting in very short and sometimes curt requests as in ‘I give the trust to fix my computer’. She employed if-conditional clause in a formulaic expression ‘if you don’t mind’, grounders ‘because...’, and politeness marker only twice. Finally, it could be concluded that MSAX’s performance before the intervention illustrated meagre pragmalinguistic resources and very limited awareness of the social parameters governing them, and thus she needed to develop such abilities.
Regarding her post-intervention performance on the WDCT, she improved *reasonably* vis-à-vis her use of attention getters and the range of the modification devices. She used ‘hey, excuse me, hello’ in around five situations out of eight, 65% improvement. However, this strategy was not consistently and flexibly applied to all situations, where she disregarded this external modification device in situations nos. 1, 4, and 8. It might be assumed that she missed it in situation no. 1, because of the high familiarity, and in situation no. 8, because of the assumed excessive power. However, for situation no. 4 where SD, P and SI are all high, the rule is not hard and fast. This confounding outcome reveals her lack of flexibility in manifesting her developing sociopragmatic competence. Although she is becoming conversant with the attention getting devices, as she applied them to some cases, she is still not adept enough to use them flexibly and to assign them regularly in all required contexts. This instable learning indicates that MSAX grapples with some features in her sociopragmatic competence, her knowledge of the contextual features in which certain TL rules should be applied. In the course of building up her sociopragmatic competence, she seems to establish hypotheses and test them targeting more even learning and thus more stable production. As for situation no. 8, it could be claimed that she assumed +P by the president of the university on addressing a student which urged her to cut down on the pre-head strategies thinking that these are unnecessary where no high stake is involved. One tenable interpretation is that she has partially acquired the TL norms where there is some faulty assumption of overpower of the university president, and thus she employed inappropriate pragmalinguistic resources according to the TL norms. Her faulty sociopragmatic calculations led to her pragmalinguistic difficulties. Another interpretation might be that she suffers a gap in her knowledge of the TL norms, where she was pushed to
lean back on her L1 socio-cultural norms to assess that situation, yielding an opportunity of latent pragmatic failure and communication breakdown (Al-Issa, 2003; Wierzbicka, 2003; Yu, 1999).

In general, MSAX seems to have developed her pragmatic competence in some respects; yet, she is still grappling with others in order to improve them. It seems that she has developed more sensitivity towards the occidental social parameters, where the level of familiarity and the negative face wants are decisive elements when making choices about which structures to use. She demonstrated features that are similar to NSs in which she sounded more tentative and hedging. She employed more elaborate structures involving a wide range of modification devices rather than restricting herself to one formula (because +NP). To wind up, she developed some abilities to produce various sophisticated structures involving pre-within-and post-head act modification devices, which she was able to employ with relative flexibility and precision to mitigate the potentially coercive force of requests.

A. Pre-head Act:
Closer inspection of MSAX’s production of the pre-head act in the pre-intervention WDCT reveals some significant features. To start with, she opened her requests with an interrogative, a disarmer, a compliment, or a need statement in general rather than using any attention getter except in one situation. What is more, only in few instances, she mitigated the potential offense that might be incurred in the request using some grounders, and thereby she hardly worked on removing any possible refusal. This was applied in well below half of the situations; however, in the rest of the situations no mitigated-preparatory
expressions were used, a quintessential case of pragmatic impairment. She relied on direct strategies and need statements in most of the situations. Her rather inapt use of the external modification devices in the pre-head act shows an urgent need to raise her awareness regarding preparing the interlocutor for the ensuing request, otherwise she runs the risk of social pressure. To illustrate, almost half of the situations were introduced with the head act ‘can you...’ to open most of her requests, with no pre-head act strategies to prepare the interlocutor for the ensuing request. She applied this technique in mostly in all situations in which she assumed either (-SI) or (-SD) or both of them combined. For example, situations nos. 1, 5, 6 and 7 were all introduced by the head act with no prefacing condition to prepare the interlocutor for the upcoming request, which again sounded unlike NSs. In casual and familiar situations such as in situation no.1, she assumed that asking her younger brother to close the window is situation where no high stake (+P, -SI, -SD) is involved and thus it requires a minimal modification device, which turns out to mismatch NSs' production. As for situation no. 5, where the learner was asking someone whom she does not know for the directions to the Engineering building, where –P and -SI were assumed and thus directness was sought on her part producing an inappropriate response ‘can you give me the directions...’. Further evidence for her divergence from NSs' could be identified in situation no. 6, in which she was asking for a lift from a classmate who lives in the same area. She started her request with no pre-head act strategies assuming familiarity with the interlocutor and her obligation to comply and react positively. It seems that she has negatively transferred her L1 cultural social norms and applied them to the foreign language context in which asking someone for a lift is not a big imposition and thus entails no elaborate modification or mitigation (see previous discussion on L1 negative transfer). Holding on to
negative transfer of her culture-bound social norms and applying them blindly to a different context, in situation no. 7, the learner had to ask the waiter for the menu in a restaurant, she commenced her request with the head act straight away ‘I need the menu’. This production seems to stem from her stereotyping waiters to be of a lower social standard and thus she assumes +P over him/her by mistake, more authoritative relationship. Thus, no obligation was sensed to mitigate her request or use elaborate expressions, in fact establishing her superior social status might be conceived as a social necessity that needs to be realised. Therefore, raising the learners’ attention towards such difference is claimed to be essential if not critical to avoid any potential communication breakdown that might be incurred, risking difficult social consequences.

With reference to MSAX post-intervention WDCT, her pre-head act production seems to have undergone substantial improvement. Unlike her pre-intervention pre-head act strategies, she started almost all her requests with a verbal call of attention, as in ‘hello, hey, excuse me’, etc. She developed an awareness of the importance of using pre-head act strategies to open the discourse, prepare the interlocutor for the ensuing request, and mitigate any possible inconvenience. She employed a wide range of external modification devices in the pre-head act stage. She used compliments in situations nos. 2 and 8, typical of NSs, where a compliment is required to entice the interlocutors and bring them to cooperate, as in, ‘I just think you are so good with at designing power point slides’ and ‘I have noticed you are very skilful in fixing computers’. In keeping with NSs, she employed disarmers in situations nos. 3 and 4, where there is a potential of a refusal. These situations involved big SI, SD and the requester had to show some awareness of the possible offense
and/or refusal as in, ‘I noticed you are so busy’ and ‘I know the course is closed’. Another feature worth mentioning in this respect is her use of lexical upgraders, comparable to NSs, in situation no. 3, where she used ‘so busy’ to intensify the illocutionary force of the disarmer, showing awareness of potential refusal, being extremely busy. Furthermore, she applied consultative makers and understaters in situations nos. 5 and 6, respectively, as in, ‘I just have a question if you don’t mind’ and ‘I know you live nearby’. In situation no. 5, she tended to prepare the interlocutors for ensuing request especially that they are strangers +SD to solicit them to cooperate and remove any potential rejection. In situation no. 6, she utilised understaters as prefacing condition along with the embedded head act in order to create a positive impression on the interlocutors and prompt them to cooperate and fulfil her request. She appears to harness wider range of devices compared to these that emerged in the pre-intervention and what is more is that she applied them with reasonable flexibility and some precision. Her rather inapt use of the external modification devices in the pre-head act in the pre-intervention seemed to wane, substituted by increasing sociopragmatic knowledge that governs her improved informed pragmalinguistic decisions. To sum up, she developed an appropriate awareness of the decisive social parameters of the context and situations, producing sophisticated structures that match those produced by NSs in the baseline data.

B. Head Act:

In her pre-intervention production task, she mostly used the unanalysed interrogative formula ‘can you…’ in almost six situations with no discernment except for situations nos. 7 and 8. None of the contextual parameters were critical in her determining her choice for
which pragmalinguistic expression to use. Regarding situations nos. 7 and 8, she used a need statement for the former and imperative for the latter. She used need statement with no mitigation where the waiter is involved. Similarly, she relied on the imperative in situation no.8, where the president of the university was addressing one of the students, assuming excessive power over the student and thus yielding ‘I give you the trust to fix my computer’. Establishing social status and power seem to be decisive in driving her choice of structures, which is unlike NSs who relied more on mild and strong hinting rather than direct request in similar cases. This performance is likely to have induced pragmatic failure and in turn communication breakdown in such situation. It seems that this learner’s pragmatic consciousness existed early before the intervention; however, it materialised only in a few features, which marks a basis to build upon using the intervention. This under-constructed competence signals a clear necessity for improving her skills and honing her abilities.

In her post-intervention production WDCT, she maintained her use of interrogative expressions in most of the situations, nevertheless more mitigation devices were involved. MSAX produced elaborate structures in almost all eight situations in her post-intervention production, except for situation no.1. She used direct strategies, unmitigated imperative. This could be attributed to the fact that this situation involved addressing her younger brother, which has a special social norm in her L1 cultural background, an instance of negative transfer. This reflects the learner’s assumption of the informality of the situation, which mismatches the speech act realisation of the NSs (see previous discussion). Except for this situation, the majority of her responses revealed that she became more elaborate. She managed to modify her requests with combinations of internal modification devices
(syntactically or lexically or a mix of both) which mark that she has heeded the potential risk of non-compliance. She produced conventionally indirect requests that are syntactically modified as in ‘if you may…’ ‘if you do not mind…’ and ‘would you mind fixing…’. She utilised interrogative, past tense to downplay aspect, if-conditional clause lowering the assertive voice of the request, continuous aspect to reduce aspect force. In the same sense, she modified her requests lexically employing a consultative maker seeking cooperation as well as downtoners as in ‘just’. The emergence of the use of the past tense to downplay tense-aspect and to impart detachment in some situations shows that the learner started to heed the use of past tense as a powerful tool to mitigate requests and hedge, a feature that is widely used by NSs. An additional feature that was noted is her shift of style in ‘can I/you…’ in the pre-intervention phase to become ‘would I…’, ‘would you mind if I…’, and the inclusive ‘we’ unfolds development. It signals her evolving sensitivity to the situational features while formulating and realising a request. Variation in addressing requestees was employed based on the learner’s evaluation of the situational cues, where more flexibility was secured. For instance, the shift from ‘you’ to ‘I’ reflects a shift in orientation, from the hearer-oriented to the speaker-oriented relaying a developing sensitivity to the hearer face-wants while formulating a request. The learner’s production is close to NSs’ production of head acts in which tentativeness and hedging started to materialise. It is widely known that NSs use interrogative expressions as well; however, they tend to temper them to be more hedging and tentative, more indirect as in ‘do you think you could…’ rather than ‘can you/ I…’. This suggests that this learner has been able to pick up on some ability to hedge and thus to sound more native-like. Unlike her faulty performance in the pre-intervention in situation no.8, she employed head act similar to that of NSs, where she tended to use opaqueness in
situation no. 8, where the meaning is not derivable from the exact words using preparations, compliments, consultative markers, past tense, interrogatives to impart more tentativeness and hedging. (Interpretations for ease of acquisition of head act, see previously mentioned discussion). It could be argued that MSAX’s knowledge of the pragmalinguistic properties of the speech community has been enhanced and that she was able to use the speech community conventionalised linguistic features in many situations with more flexibility and with reasonable precision, yet no partial reference to the request act was performed, no hinting was employed. It could be argued that this linguistic feature is underway and that it needs to be further fostered, in order to be applied properly and flexibly in her production at a later on stage. To fully match NSs’ production, MSAX still needs to widen her pragmalinguistic repertoire, to further hone her pragmatic skills. It is worth noting that MSAX has started at almost an average level before the intervention which might have contributed to facilitating her acquisition of pragmatic competence incorporating new pragmatic features into her ILP in the post-intervention stage, profiting well from the intervention. The average level refers to the learner’s ability to communicate using the TL with an an acceptable level of pragmatic knowledge, where there is a potential of social tension. She might have started at second stage of pragmatic development or above.

C. Post-head Act:

Regarding MSAX’s post-head act production on the pre-intervention WDCT, she employed a number of post-head act modification devices. In situations nos. 4 and 7, she used expressions of appreciation and politeness markers showing gratitude for doing the request as in ‘I will appreciate’ and ‘please’, respectively. It could be argued that the learner
assumed +P and thought that she needs more directness and thus less elaboration structures to realise her requests. As for situation no. 7, she employed lexical downgraders such as politeness marker ‘please’. It seems that MSAX has positively transferred her own L1 cultural norms where the politeness marker ‘please’ would be overused and thus she benefited from transferring it (Ellis, 1997; Kasper, 1997b). However, no other modification device typical of NSs’ production was used, which demonstrates a classical case of positive L1 transfer rather than pragmatic awareness of the sociocultural norms that govern this situation. Ishihara and Cohen, A. (2014: 78-79) refer to this effect as “influence of the learners’ knowledge of other languages and cultures on their pragmatic use and development on the use of the L2”. Otherwise, she would have employed the full-fledged modification devices that are used by NSs. According to Ringbom (1987:134, cited in Gass & Selinker, 2001:117), L1 “works as pegs upon which learners can hang on new information by making use of already existing knowledge, thereby facilitating learning”. With more of re-conceptualisation of transfer, selectivity should play a vital role in deciding what to be transferred and what should be restricted, MSAX does not seem to apply this facility wisely. Another post head-act modification device was employed which is the grounders. She managed to give reasons for her requests in a number of situations to round off to her request as in situations nos. 1, 3 and 6. She tended to use these grounders where it is likely that she thought explanation was necessary in order for her request to be considered. Particularly in situations nos. 3 and 6, where the tutor was very busy in the former (+SI) and the requestee is simply a classmate who is supposed to give the lift (+SD) in the latter. In general, it could be claimed that her performance in this respect fluctuated revealing mixed results and reflecting her mixed command of the TL pragmatics.
Regarding MSAX’s post head-act production strategies on the post-intervention WDCT, it appears that her abilities did not benefit much from the intervention. Unlike NSs, MSAX employed a few of these strategies reflecting limited pragmatic ability with a strong note that she has to progress with her abilities. She was noticed to employ a single strategy, grounders, in situation no.5 only. Winding-up her request with no post-head act in almost all situations do not reflect her lack of familiarity with this aspect of the language, because this feature was noticed in her production in the pre-intervention WDCT. In fact, this confounding outcome may relate to her confusion regarding being extensively polite and thus whether to be elaborate or not, the extent to which she needs to be verbose. It seems that her ineffective post head-act strategies stem from her undivided focus on embellishing her pre- and within- head act, unheeding post-head act moves. She modified her head-act effectively to the extent that she could not extend this attention to her post head-act; she was not able to take it a step further. Her undivided attention was concentrated on both the pre-head act and within the head-act, leaving out the post-head act unnoticed and thus unlearned (Schmidt, 1993,1995, 2001). On matching her production with that of NSs, it seems that she lacked using appreciation expressions, gratitude, promise of reward and politeness markers that were used by NSs. This regression in performance marks the participant’s accreting and evolving pragmatic knowledge. She has learned some features but she still stumbles with others such as the ability of how to integrate post-head act devices successfully and appropriately in communicating her intents. Her pragmatic knowledge is developed in some respects; she has a firm grip of the modification strategies that she used in modifying the pre-head act and the head act according to the NSs’ norms. One possible argument that can be put forward in here is that this participant is experiencing restructuring, in which new
knowledge is pushing the old one and thus re-organisation is occurring leading to some knowledge loss, misplacement of attention to some key feature to the virtue of others (Norouzian & Eslami, 2016; Ishihara & Cohen, A., 2014; Gass & Selinker, 2001; and McLaughlin, 1990). However, with a dearth of evidence, no conclusive statements could be made.

D. Types of Strategies:
The types of strategies that were used by MSAX developed from heavily relying on direct requests, with a few instances of conventionally indirect and non-conventionally indirect strategies in the pre-intervention to move towards more consistent application of conventionally indirect strategies and few mitigated direct ones in the post-intervention WDCT. To illustrate, in the pre-intervention, the head act in the majority of her situations were direct such as her use of need statement as in ‘I need the menu’ or performatives as in ‘I give you the trust...’. She also used some conventionally indirect strategies in her head acts as in ‘can you...’. Her mixed command of this wide range of strategies demonstrates some emergent pragmatic awareness in her pre-intervention, yet that was not aligned with a corresponding pragmalinguistic knowledge. In fact, her linguistic repertoire suffered from limitedness that could not allow her to express and encode her TL concepts reflecting a real tenure of this range of strategies’ transparency.

On the other hand, in the post-intervention WDCT, MSAX relied on a mix of mitigated direct strategies as well as some conventionally indirect strategies. She employed this variety in situations nos. 2 through situation no. 8 on the post-intervention. To illustrate, many
instances of conventionally indirect requests were employed as in, ‘would I...?’ ‘may I ...?’ ‘would you mind if I...?’. With the emergence of these features in her language use, it can be stated that she has developed her pragmatics competence to some extent and that her awareness has been raised regarding the pragmalinguistic as well as the sociopragmatic features. She became equipped with wider linguistic resources and she has been sensitised to sociopragmatic features of the language that govern the use of these linguistic resources. She tended to employ conventionally indirect strategies in about all her situations, roughly avoiding pragmatic failure and using pragmatic competence strategically. This was not necessarily the case with situation no. 1, where casualness was assumed; thus, she employed more directness using unmitigated imperative head act. Thus, her production marginally diverted from that of NSs. However, the majority of her requests on the post-intervention demonstrated more of a native-like production employing conventionally indirect strategies. The frequency of using conventionally indirect strategies on the post-intervention surpassed that of the pre-intervention, where she consistently applied conventionally indirect strategies instead of the irregular use she displayed in the pre-intervention. Using conventionally indirect strategies as an outcome may relate to the fact that she resorted to a middle ground in which she felt more secured away from violating any of the newly adopted norms. Nevertheless, her level of precision was compromised relying on a single type of strategy. Although her production has undergone some sensible improvement, it appears that she is still struggling with her linguistic resources which she needs to cope with the high demands of situations be them familiar or unfamiliar.
E. Stages of L2 Request Development:

On assessing MSAX according to the stages of L2 request development (Achiba, 2003 & Ellis, 1992, cited in Kasper & Rose, 2002: 140), it can be concluded that she has developed from stage 3, the unpacking stage, to stage 4, the pragmatic expansion stage. She improved from illustrating features that pertain to the unpacking stage to using aspects of the pragmatic expansion stage. For instance, she shifted from using formulas such as ‘can you …’ to using a repertoire of new pragmalinguistic forms among others are ‘would you mind...’ ‘may I’, as well as her use of more mitigation devices and more complex structures including if-conditional clauses, past tense and interrogatives. She unpacked from the use of direct and conventionally indirect requests in which she relied basically on unpacked formulaic expressions to incorporate elaborate mitigating expressions.

A noteworthy feature that emerged in her pre-intervention WDCT and dissipated in her post-intervention WDCT is her use of mild hinting as well as her use of the post head-act strategies. In situation no.3, she produced ‘let me see you’, in which she bounced back to be more transparent, using a conventionally indirect strategy in post-intervention. She also seemed to round off roughly all of her requests in the pre-intervention WDCT (six cases out of eight) with a post head-act strategy in more instances in comparison to her post-intervention (only one instance). One interpretation for her jagged profile of performance might be that these internal modification devices (lexical-syntactical) occur anywhere in the sequence, as part of the head act or within any other move which adds to their complexity. The idiosyncratic characteristics of these modifications devices probably made them difficult to learn, cognitively demanding, and hence MSAX could not fully internalise. The learnability
of the use of these devices might come at a later stage and they might be slowly developing. The overstretched cognitive abilities of the learner seem to be unable to extend further to cope with high processing linguistic features of processes.

On matching the previously mentioned findings of the recognition task of MSAX on the MDCT, she was found to have improved with almost 30%, scoring 9 out of 10 on the post-intervention MDCT, rather than 6 out of 10 on the pre-intervention MDCT. It can be distinguished that these findings seem to be perfectly aligned with her performance on the WDCT. Her post-intervention contribution outperformed her pre-intervention, in which she demonstrated better performance in most respects, her pre-head and head act strategies as well as her level of directness that she employed. She consistently attempted to be polite and appropriate by downplaying the possibly coercive, face-threatening effect and the assertive voice of the request. The participant succeeded in extending her pragmatic abilities in some respects. She attained some new pragmalinguistic features which emerged in her production as indication that they had been added to her linguistic repertoire with heavy use of more complex syntactical structures and elaborate realisations. She showed an understanding of how to adjust her requestive force with reference to interlocutors, goals, and the contextual cues. In spite of the higher demands involved in WDCT as a task type compared to MDCT, MSAX was able to substantially improve in her performance.
3. Participant YLAX

YLAX represents the zero change segment. On analysing the performance of YLAX, there were clear indications that her production on the pre-intervention WDCT demonstrated her limited pragmatic ability particularly when compared with her production on the post-intervention WDCT. Her production revealed several features including her inability to employ complex embedded sentence structures. She had a tendency to use more direct and less elaborated expressions with no extensive politeness supporting moves. To illustrate, she used fairly underdeveloped requests in situations nos. 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7 unlike situations nos. 1, 4 and 8, which looked to be just under moderately developed. In the former set of situations, she focused on the head act only rather than combining and supporting them with pre-and post-head act modification devices. Another feature that is worth mentioning is that she used ‘would you please...’ formula in almost five situations out of the eight revealing a lack of sensitivity to whether the situation is formal or casual and familiar, no sociopragmatic awareness. Thus, pragmatic failure was bound to occur in her communication since her interlocutor’s sociocultural expectations were never met in her production. She also overused the politeness marker ‘please’ in about three quarters of the situations in an attempt to appear polite and less face-threatening in situations that she considered to be formal, high-stake. In spite of her sincere willingness to cater for the face wants of her interlocutors, she ended up with a production that is quite divergent from that of NSs. This tendency to downplay her brusque requests using the more direct, simple formulaic expression coupled with ‘please’ rather than mitigated-preparation expressions suggests her awareness of the sociopragmatic norms. It appears that her pragmalinguistic ability is rather limited and that she is unfamiliar with wider range of linguistic expressions to
realise these behaviours. One tenable interpretation for her overuse of ‘please’ is that it is an illocutionary force indicator and that it is a transparent mitigator that many learners, with intermediate level of proficiency prefer to use for its ease and transparency (Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2009, 2012). This faulty performance suggests that YLAX suffered from insufficient linguistic resources as well as rather limited pragmatic knowledge. She needs to be equipped with the required pragmatic knowledge to use the relevant utterances necessary in order be to considered a competent converser and to interpret meaning contextually correct communicating her needs and goals.

On the other hand, YLAX’s performance on the post-intervention WDCT showed reasonable improvement in which she demonstrated her awareness of modification devices and expressions, her developing consciousness of the social tension that may result from the face-threatening request and finally her realisation of the arising need to maintain the cordial relationship with the interlocutors involved in the situation. YLAX’s contribution in the post-intervention WDCT seemed to be more elaborate than that of the pre-intervention in many respects. She included rather complex linguistic expressions and politeness supporting moves reflecting greater level of politeness. Her production appears to have developed some sensitivity regarding the sociocultural aspects of the TL and, in turn, the corresponding style shifting. She seems to have become more sensitised to the situational variables that interlocutors expect. She used ‘it would be really very helpful for me to...’ ‘I was wondering if you would allow me...’ ‘would you mind taking me...’ ‘if you helped me in fixing it, I would give you...’ and so on. Almost all her production illustrated her strategic intention of being as polite as possible in communicating her illocutionary intent and
realising her request. She relied heavily on indirect strategies to appear polite using extensive politeness techniques. She managed to use both external and internal modification devices effectively and in a native-like fashion. She tended to use the past tense to syntactically downplay the possible tension that may result from face-threatening requests. Employing the past tense among other syntactic downgraders that she used such as the if-conditional clause, interrogative, and conditional structure demonstrate the learner’s developing pragmalinguistic competence. To illustrate, she produced structures as in: ‘I was wondering if...’ ‘would you mind if I ...’ ‘if you helped me...’. Finally, she incorporated some combinations of syntactical internal modification devices as in her use of conditional clause to infer tentativeness lowering the assertive voice of the request, interrogatives to impart freedom to the interlocutor, and the past tense to communicate detachment from request. Past tense maker is a syntactical downgrader that emerged in some of her post-intervention situations though it is a feature that never appeared in her pre-intervention WDCT.

Nonetheless, her production lacked some native-like features such as her inability to sound tentative and hedging as in ‘you will design the PowerPoint I know you are the best’ in which she appeared more imposing and forceful and thus less polite. It could be argued that this is an instance of inflexibility on the part of the learner or instability of her learning rather than a gap in her pragmalinguistic knowledge. This is because she was able to produce some hedging structures as in situation no. 8, as in ‘what do you think?’ as a post head-act strategy. Therefore, she possesses the knowledge yet she is not able to apply it evenly. Using this mitigated-preparatory expression shows the learner’s use of strategic device to
solicit the interlocutor to comply with his or her intent; the speech act becomes jointly established by the interlocutor and the learner. One interpretation for her performance might be that internal modifications devices (lexical-syntactical) occur anywhere in the sequence, as part of the head act or within any other move, flexibility of placement indicate no rule to be governing them which make them cognitively demanding to be learned. The idiosyncratic characteristics of these modifications devices probably made them difficult to learn putting off their learning at a latter stage. Another drift away from native-like production is that she hardly used an apology expression in her entire production. Missing such elements in her production refers to the fact that her performance is developing and that her linguistic resources and ability are still incomplete in a way with no flexibility to be assumed. Her lack of use of apology may stem from sociopragmatic failure, where she is unaware of the fact that she needs to maintain a cordial relationship under the tension resulting from the face-threatening request situation. It seems that she never considered that such tension deserves an apology on her part. She never offered an apologetic expression in situations such as that of the very busy tutor with whom she needs to arrange an appointment to discuss her essay, not even in the situation where she needs to register in a course that has already been closed, or when she interrupted a stranger to ask for the directions. Though, she mismatched the NSs' production in this specific target pragmatic feature, she managed to use other mitigated-preparatory expressions in these very situations employing disarmers, cost-minimisers, grounders and intensifiers. YLAX has developed her sociopragmatic knowledge to some extent, but she still has to expend further effort to achieve further precision in her pragmalinguistic forms production. Finally, frequent
grammatical inaccuracies were detected, yet they never impeded communication and thus meaning could easily come across.

A. Pre-head Act:
In the pre-intervention WDCT, YLAX initiated her requests with alerters in almost half of the situations, however, they were more or less informal as in ‘hi’. Given the contexts of these interactions, using ‘hi’ would not be expected in a tutor’s office or a university president’s office, either. In fact, the shift of formality in her alerters indicates her inadequate knowledge of the sociocultural variables and their communicative intents. Addressing her tutor saying ‘hi’ in situation no. 3 as well as the president of the university addressing one of the students whom he is not familiar with saying ‘hi’ embodies this deficient pragmatic knowledge. Her invariable use of ‘hi’ with no reference to the sociocultural variables of the situations implies her insufficient knowledge of the sociopragmatic norms of the TL and its communicative practices. In almost six situations out of eight, she commenced her request with no pre-head strategies to prepare the interlocutor for the ensuing request and to reduce the possible threat or offense in making the request, which yielded unsuccessful request realisation. Only one instance was noted to have included a mitigated-preparatory expression involving a compliment in situation no. 2 ‘you are very good with computers’. This marks the participant’s limited linguistic knowledge and ability to produce these expressions, which she was not able to employ effectively due to her lack of awareness of the rules that govern integrating them in successful communication.

With reference to her post-intervention WDCT, YLAX’s production demonstrated some significantly positive features. Unlike her pre-intervention WDCT, she was able to employ
the attention getter external modification device successfully. She shifted towards more formality in getting the interlocutor’s attention using native-like expression, ‘excuse me’, in situations nos. 4 and 5 where there is little familiarity (+SD) between the interlocutors. Similarly, in situations nos. 3 and 8, where (+P) was at play, she utilised either ‘hello’ or ‘good morning’. She also used the first name ‘Ahmed’ calling out for her brother which sounded spontaneous and native-like assuming familiarity. As for the rest of the situations, she commonly resorted to the usual alerter ‘hi’. Employing this variety of attention getters besides the pattern of their placement according to the situational variables reflect the participant’s burgeoning awareness of assessing the sociocultural variables of the situations at hand, form-function-context mappings, sociopragmatic competence. In the same vein, the participant included various pre-head act modification devices to prepare the interlocutors to the ensuing request and to reduce the possible threat that may result out of making it. She incorporated more extensive politeness supportive moves. For instance, she employed permission ‘may I talk to you for a minute’, disarmer ‘I know you are very busy’ ‘may I talk to you for a second please?’, compliment ‘you are very good with computers’, discourse orientation ‘I have just received my essay back’ ‘are you going back home now?’ ‘are you doing something now?’, grounder ‘as a group presentation we are working together…’ ‘it is very important in order to graduate’ ‘it would be very helpful for me to know my mistakes’, and so on. Using these modification devices indicates the participant’s developing pragmalinguistic competence. In other words, she demonstrates ability to appear polite linguistically incorporating complex embedded structures and depending on array of expressions to prepare the interlocutors to the upcoming request, bolstering them for the given circumstances. She probably attempts to create a positive impression to remove any
potential objection. Her pre-head act strategies probably served as mitigated-preparatory expressions that aimed at bringing the interlocutors to comply with her request. Finally, it could be concluded that YLAX’s pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic competences were developing and that several features emerged in her production denoting this progress.

When compared to NSs, YLAX’s post-intervention WDCT lacked a few features. In spite of her improved overall linguistic expressions and the grammaticality of the expressions employed, which made her comprehensible, a few native-like features were still absent. Her non-conformity to NSs’ conversational norms essentially rests on her very limited use of both tentativeness and hedging which NSs were inclined to employ heavily allowing more freedom to their interlocutors as to whether they comply with their communicative intent. Situation no. 8 is an exception. Her variable command in producing such modification devices reflects that her skills still need further enhancement, producing slightly forceful directives that are likely to lead to serious circumstances unless rectification are applied to her pragmalinguistic competence.

**B. Head Act:**

In the pre-intervention WDCT, YLAX relied heavily on interrogatives in her requests. She employed ‘would you please...’ as an unpacked formula in more than half of the situations. She also used ‘can I please...’ in two other situations and the imperative in one instance only. She had a tendency to incorporate formulas into productive language use rather than using a variety of linguistic expressions and resources bestowing little sensitivity to the sociocultural variables of the situations. Therefore, it can be noted that her choice to the use of pre-
determined formulas to realise her request reflects her meagre linguistic resources and her lack of pragmatic flexibility to accomplish communicative purposes.

Regarding her post-intervention WDCT, it was clear that YLAX managed to realise her requests using both direct and indirect strategies. Based on the situational variables, she employed range of strategies including mild hinting, interrogative, mitigated-preparatory expressions, conditional and imperative. To illustrate, she said: ‘it would be very helpful for me to discuss it with you’ ‘I was wondering if you would...’ ‘would you mind taking me...’ ‘would you please tell me how to...’ ‘if you helped me, I would...’ and ‘close the window’. It could be claimed that this resourceful use of head-act requests is due to the apt calculation of the situational variables combined with her growing pragmalinguistic competence. Her ability to extend herself using mild hints as in situation no. 2 indicates her developing pragmatic ability including both the pragmalinguistic and the sociopragmatic competences. The data revealed that her post-intervention production head act involved more modification devices rather than these used in her pre-intervention. To illustrate, she incorporated a combination of internal modification devices as in syntactical and lexical downgraders. She used syntactical downgraders as in the past tense, the conditional clause, and the interrogative. She employed these devices in situations nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8 to downplay the big size of imposition in situation no. 3 and the lack of familiarity in no. 4. She integrated the if-conditional clause in situations nos. 3, 4, and 8 since there is little familiarity (+SD) in the first two situations and there is high power (+P) in the last one, having to deal with the president of the university. She skilfully incorporated interrogative structures in all formerly mentioned situations, all five, to mitigate the request and moderate its illocutionary force. She also used lexical downgraders as in consultative marker, downtoners well as politeness
marker seeking cooperation as in situations nos. 4, 6 for consultative marker; situations nos. 3, 6 for hedgers and downtoners; and situations nos. 1, 4, 5, 7, and 8 for politeness marker (see previously mentioned interpretations for the ease of acquisition of head-act). Therefore, it could be claimed that her production on the post-intervention WDCT outdid that of her pre-intervention. Head acts are governed by clear and transparent rules, easy to induce from context which might have facilitated their acquisition at an early stage of development with much flexibility and some precision.

C. Post-head Act:

With reference to the pre-intervention WDCT post-head act, situations nos. 3, 4, 5, and 8 included expressions of either appreciation, sweeteners, or promise of reward. It could be claimed that this participant had sociocultural sensitivity to the situational variables in these situations in which the interlocutors were her tutor, her professor, a stranger, and the president of the university to a skilful student. She grasped that she had to show appreciation in the former situation or promise reward in the last one to bring the interlocutors to cooperate and comply with her communicative intent. To illustrate, she commonly used ‘thank you’ in almost half the instances and she coupled it with an intensifier in only one instance as in ‘your consideration is highly appreciated’ in situation no. 4. This could be explained in terms of her up-and-coming awareness of the sociocultural variables that were at play in this situation where she wanted to sign up for a course that has already been closed and she is asking this from a professor whom she does not really know.
Her emerging awareness of the use of the post-head act strategies was taken a step further in her post-intervention WDCT. She used expressions of appreciation in the same way she had used them in the pre-intervention stage in the same situations as well as situation no. 6. She seems to have developed her knowledge of the post-head act strategies in the sense that she integrated more intensifiers as ‘I would really appreciate it’ ‘would really be helpful’ ‘thank you in advance’ ‘thank you so much’ and so on. She also started using some external modification devices as for instance, cost-minimising techniques as in ‘I am the same way as yours’, promise of reward as in ‘I will give you a bonus’, grounder as in ‘it is very important for me’ and so on; rather than the restricted number of strategies used in the pre-intervention stage. It could be argued that her progress is evident particularly that a feature that was detected to be heavily used by NSs and scarcely used by NNSs emerged in her performance such as post-head act strategies with lexical downgraders and upgraders.

**D. Types of Strategies:**

With reference to the types of strategies that YLAX used in the pre-intervention stage, it could be clearly observed that she employed a mix of the direct strategies and the conventionally indirect strategies. For instance, she used ‘would you please ...’ structure in almost half of the situations which is a conventionally indirect strategy. Similarly, she used ‘can I please...’ as well as ‘do you know...’ in two different cases situations nos. 4 and 5, respectively. This is besides her use of the direct strategies in situations nos. 3 and 7 where she employed the implicit performative in the former as in, ‘I would like to discuss...’, and she employed the imperative in the latter as in, ‘the menu please’. This implies that this participant has been able to demonstrate some sociopragmatic ability to assess the
sociocultural variables of the context of the situations where she was able to appear polite in about half of her production in the pre-intervention stage using some politeness strategies, being less direct developing her head-act request.

On the other hand, as for these strategies on the post-intervention WDCT, YLAX managed to employ a wider range of strategies than those used in the pre-intervention stage. She used a mixture of direct, conventionally indirect, as well as non-conventionally indirect strategies. To exemplify, she used direct strategy as mitigated imperative in situation no. 1, where the interlocutor was her younger brother and she was asking him to close the window and directness sounded in keeping with NSs’ production. Implicit performatives was used in situation no. 7 where she had to ask the waiter for the menu in a restaurant: (+SD, -P, -SI), so the situation did not call for extensive politeness as in ‘I would like to ask you for the menu’. Taking transparency to a further step, YLAX tended to be less forceful and less transparent producing more conventionally indirect requests in situations nos. 4, 5, 6, and 8.

She used consultative makers in situations nos. 4, 5 and 6 as in ‘I was wondering if...’, ‘would you mind taking me...’, and conditional structure as in situation no. 8 as in ‘if you helped me, I would...’. Finally, non-conventionally indirect strategies seemed to emerge in her pragmatic production after the intervention which she was manifested in her production in situation no. 2 as in, ‘I just receive the essay back and if it is ok with you, it would be really helpful for me to discuss it. Would you help me?’ This new feature was noted to surface only after the intervention, which is marked feature of NSs’ production. Accordingly, it can be claimed that the participant’s production after the intervention has shown some native-like features that were missing in her production before the intervention. She seems to have built
on the knowledge that she had before the instruction towards achieving her communicative targets. Hence, it can be assumed that both her pragmalinguistic as well as her sociopragmatic competences were fostered to be in line with those of NSs. This could be possibly due to the high exposure that she had experienced in during the intervention as well as the enhancement techniques and that her awareness was further promoted to embrace additional functional features of the TL. Another reason might be her motivation and her willingness to expend effort to realise her communicative targets (Kecskes, 2013; Gass & Mackey, 2012).

E. Stages of L2 Request Development:

On assessing YLAX according to stages of L2 request development (Achiba, 2003 & Ellis, 1992, cited in Kasper & Rose, 2002: 140), it can be deduced that she has subtly developed. She seems to be stagnating in stage 4, the pragmatic expansion stage, which is where she started, a quite sophisticated stage already. She demonstrated some of the features of this stage in both the pre-intervention stage as well as the post-intervention. Her performance did not show great improvements in terms of her head-act as well as her post-head act production. To illustrate, she was able to employ conventionally indirect strategies in both the pre-and the post- intervention stages. She employed some modification devices such as appreciation, promise of rewards, in both the pre- and the post-intervention stages, with a little more elaboration in the post-intervention stage as in the use of grounders and intensifiers in few cases, though. This was not necessarily the case, however. The pre-head act was noted to act differently in the sense that her pre-head act strategies in the post-intervention were more extensive than those of the pre-intervention, that has witnessed
considerable development. Thus, it can be concluded that YLAX’s performance on the post-intervention WDCT has witnessed marginal development where her pre-intervention production demonstrated some native-like feature and it is likely to yield some successful communication.

On matching the previously mentioned findings of the recognition task of YLAX on the MDCT, where she was found to have remained stable with no change on her scores regarding her pre-and post-intervention MDCTs, scoring 6 correct responses out of 10 on both questionnaires. It can be easily determined that the steadiness of performance before and after the intervention did not experience considerable change, therefore the results from the MDCT match that of the WDCT in this respect. It appears that YLAX’s performance seemed to undergo few incremental small changes and thus stability can be assumed. On a different note, as for the degree of change which her performance has witnessed, it can be stated that her performance on the recognition MDCT does not match her production on the WDCT with reference to indexing her pragmatic competence. It can be argued that her ability to recognise what is pragmatically appropriate does not match her ability to produce sound and acceptable structures, which was noted to be in some advanced stage. Her ability to recognise only 60% of the appropriate structures on the MDCT and maintaining this relatively average performance even after the intervention is a confounding outcome in the sense that the participant’s access the ability to produce preceded her ability to recognise. This interesting finding deviates from the general consensus that perception primes production (discussed further in Chapter 6). Brown and Levinson (1987) among others widely believe that assessing the situational variables besides perceiving the sociocultural
norms are context-specific as well as culture-specific. According to Blum-Kulka and House (1989:137, cited in Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2010: 263), “members of different cultures might differ in their perceptions of social situations as well as in the relative importance attributed to any of the social parameters mentioned”. However, later in this chapter in YLAX’s case, it is clear that not only did her perception diverge from that of NSs as far as she is a NNS, but also her access of production surpassed that of perception, which is untypical of research findings. Regarding her underdeveloped perception, it could be argued that YLAX has transferred her L1 cultural norms in evaluating some situations, which have impeded her ability to recognise appropriately pragmatically sound utterances in some cases. Taguchi (2014: 25) argues that having to control and manage one’s own cultural knowledge and L1 pragmatic knowledge could be taxing burden on the learner’s cognitive processing. It might be an additional load that the learner has to deal with besides acquiring new pragmatic knowledge (Takahashi, 2013; Castillo, 2009). In other words, she called upon her own L1 cultural norms in which pragmatic clarity and directness are equated with honesty rather than politeness according to the TL sociocultural norms. Hence, it could be claimed that she was able to conform to the TL sociocultural norms in her production, whereas she was not able to call upon these same norms in her perception where her complete linguistic processing may not be necessary, she simply had to select the appropriate form from the input. With a dearth of evidence, it cannot be claimed that this is commonly the case that perception may lag behind production and that learners might not be able to call upon the same norms equally for both their perception and production. A case in point, she produced appropriate structures in TL in her WDCT with well-above moderate improvement in her post-intervention, before being able to recognise them in her
MDCT with stagnating results standing at 6 out of 10 on both the pre and the post-intervention tasks. YLAX’s case is one of the surprising cases with unexpected findings, where her production outperformed her perception to a large extent. (YGAX is a similar case as well).
4. Participant HRAX

HRAX represents the outlier segment, a minor decline participant. On analysing the performance of HRAX, it could be clearly stated that her production has *hardly undergone any improvement* from the pre-intervention stage on the WDCT to post-intervention stage except in few aspects. She made progress in only 2 situations compared to falling back in 4 situations and maintaining a steady performance in 2. Several key features could be identified in her performance where she marginally developed her production in situations nos. 4 and 6. She became relatively elaborate using a wide-ranging gamut of request strategies involving more external and internal modification devices in these situations. For instance, in situation no. 6 in the pre-intervention, she hardly used mitigated-preparatory expressions in the pre-head act position except for the attention getter, whereas on the post-intervention task, she responded using an attention getter, a pre-commitment, a grounder, a politeness marker and a cost-minimiser. She sounded reasonably elaborate where she realised her request with an extensive use of politeness supporting modification devices. However, she fell back significantly in situations nos. 2, 3, 5 and 8, where her production was fairly close to native-like production on the pre-intervention, yet it declined on the post-intervention. She reverted back with a tendency to produce directives that are more direct and rather pragmatically inappropriate for the contextual conditions of the situations. To illustrate, ‘I will give you the power point slides task’, ‘I want you to fix my computer please’. She showed preference to using want-statements for mitigated-preparatory interrogatives, strong and mild hints; features that are typical of NSs. Her production was marked with fair complexity, yielding some elaborate responses, which involved subtle language characteristics which NNSs usually struggle with to acquire such as intensifiers, pre-
commitment, disarmers, and apology. These marked devices were heavily present in the participant’s production in her pre-intervention WDCT in comparison to the post-one. Another remarkable observation that is worth mentioning in HRAX’s production on her pre-intervention WDCT is that she used the past tense as a syntactical internal modification device in almost half the situations situation no. 4, 5, 6, and 8. She seems use this target pragmatic feature with limited flexibility with reference to their assignment (for interpretations for her jagged profile of performance see previous discussions on difficulty of internal modification devices and L1 interference). Finally, it could be stated that HRAX declined in her performance in instances that outnumbered the ones in which she has shown improvement. Thus, her performance has experienced fluctuation with mixed abilities, with an air of slight improvement in a couple of cases.

Several notable features were detected in her production in her post-intervention task. In most cases on both of her production tasks (pre-and post-intervention), her language was grammatically correct yet in many instances, her pragmatic production sounded inappropriate. She typically used prefabricated formulaic expressions, her level of directness in realising her requests and her adherence to some politeness techniques are some of the significant features that can be denoted in her production in the post-intervention task. Unlike her pre-intervention task, her responses tended to be brisk and terse, making her speech sound meagre, forceful and imposing. This performance is likely to generate pragmatic failure and to deny this learner the chance to communicate her communicative intents successfully. To illustrate, in situation no.2 in the pre-intervention, she used suggestions as in ‘How about designing the power point slides?’ with more tentativeness
and hedging, whereas in the post-intervention, she was more likely to be coercive and forceful in realising her request as in ‘I will give you the power point slides’. Similarly, in situation no. 3 in the post-intervention, she tended to produce a fairly short utterance to realise her request, which sounded rather curt for a situation that required more elaboration and extensiveness, where she as a student wanted to discuss her essay with a tutor who seemed to be very busy. Likewise, in situation no. 8, she was disposed to employ a want statement rather than NSs’ mild hinting in similar situations or even her own production on the pre-intervention as in: ‘I was wondering if...’. However, on situations nos. 1 and 7, she performed more or less the same in both the pre-and the post-intervention stages, which was more or less appropriate, near native-like production. Having mentioned these confounding observations, it could be suggested that her prior awareness of and her sensitivity to pragmatics, shown in the pre-intervention stage, has enabled her to identify some sociopragmatic features as well as the contextual parameters that are needed to be borne into consideration to produce some pragmatically sound and appropriate TL. In general, her performance was discerned to commonly incorporate some modification devices, she employed some pre-and post-head act strategies, which ranged between external and internal modification devices.

From a pedagogical standpoint, this incidence may be an indication of restructuring phenomenon, where new learning forces and impels change to already internalised representations. According to information-processing models of language acquisition (McLaughlin, 1987, 1990), when information is reorganised into new categories restructuring is thought to be at play especially where one’s ability is limited to be divided between old
and new information. In other words, when acquiring additional linguistic knowledge, this piece of knowledge should be organised in our internal language system, i.e. it should be structured which necessitates shuffling one's old system in some respects. With reference to McLaughlin (1987: 138, cited in Gass & Selinker, 2001: 209-10), "whereas some learning is seen to occur continuously by accretion ... other learning is thought to occur in a discontinuous fashion, by restructuring." This phase of restructuring is thought to be some to some extent self, internal-organisation, rather than external organisation, which may lead to a phase of instability where new structures appear and others are misplaced. According to Larsen-Freeman and Cameron (2008: 148), the whole linguistic system of the learner is more or less 'teetering on the brink of chaos'. With limited capacity for processing, this phase of instability or turning point may be thought to precede any kind of coalescing of new information into the learner's IL system or before she shows any signs of progress. However, as for the participant HRAX, it is difficult to ascertain whether progress should ensue unless further investigations should be accommodated to further study her case. Hence, it can be claimed that this unstable nature might be the impetus for the learner's improvement or waning of performance until her Interlanguage (IL) system stabilises by integrating this new knowledge.

A. Pre-head Act:

In the pre-intervention, HRAX started her requests with a variety of pre-head modification devices. To illustrate, she employed phrases like for instance, 'hey bro' 'hey, I know you are the best here' in informal situations and 'sorry for disturbing you' 'hello professor, and so on in formal ones. Employing this range of expressions sheds light on the fact that her
pragmalinguistic ability was both wide and flexible; in fact, her placement of these pre-head act devices indicates decisions that are well-grounded in robust pragmatic abilities in this respect.

With reference to the post-intervention task, she utilised more or less the same variety of pre-head act modification devices such as attention getters, mitigated-preparatory expressions, cost-minimisers, grounders, compliments, and pre-commitment indicators. It is worth mentioning that cost-minimisers are a novel device that has emerged in HRAX’s production in the post-intervention task that was not there in the pre-intervention one. In spite of the emergence of new external modification devices in post-intervention pre-head act, her pre-intervention pre-head acts production seemed fairly complex in comparison to her post-intervention which she sounded more restricted. The frequency and the flexibility of assignment of the pre-head act modification devices that were employed in the pre-intervention were higher and more appropriate than those used in the post-intervention.

B. Head Act:

As for the head-act employed by HRAX in her pre-intervention, she mostly used interrogative, except for situation no. 1 in which she used the imperative assuming familiarity with her younger brother as in ‘close the window’. Noteworthy to mention is that almost all the interrogatives that HRAX employed in her pre-intervention head-act were syntactically modified using the past tense, as previously mentioned. She also employed suggestions in situation no. 2, which is detected to be in line with NSs’ baseline production. To wind-up, there is compelling evidence that her pre-intervention production seems to be acceptable,
though no way perfectly aligned to native-like production, still needing further refinement regarding her precision. For instance, she overused the politeness marker ‘please’ in 65% of her production, situations nos. 1, 3, 4, 5 and 7. It could be argued that her divergence from NSs’ production is likely to get through without impeding communication in its intercultural sense, which is less rigorous than that of NSs. In other words, her performance is acceptable and unlikely to cause serious pragmatic failure among NSs, although it is not unreservedly matching that of NSs.

Regarding her post-intervention head act, HRAX succeeded in maintaining her use of internally modified interrogatives using the past tense in almost half of her production. This is besides her inappropriate use of mitigated-want statements in another two situations as in, ‘I just want to arrange for an urgent appointment’ in situation no. 3 and ‘I want you to fix my computer’ in situation no. 8. It seems that there was some to some extent negative transfer of her own cultural social values, where the president (situation no. 8) is assumed to have some high power over the student. Assuming superiority, he/she is potentially allowed to drop all politeness measures and address the student directly and authoritatively ascertaining his social status dominance. Her use of direct strategies in the former situations could be acceptable especially that she paired with some mitigation devices, using the cost-minimiser ‘just’ as well as the intensifier ‘urgent’ to downplay the assertive voice and the force of the request. However, in the latter case, her directness was never tempered or modified and thus it sounded forceful and imposing, which is not in keeping with the NSs’ baseline data. It is likely to generate an instance of pragmatic failure with some social deleterious consequences. Thus, her production involved some potential social tensions.
C. Post-head Act:

Regarding the post-head act strategies, HRAX in her pre-intervention concluded her request with minimal post head-acts except for situation no. 3, where she used a cost-minimiser ‘it will only take five minutes’. In this situation, she seems to be aware of the importance of downplaying the force of the request by using diminutive expressions as an imposition minimiser move. However, she used no expressions similar to those used by NSs. It seems that her pragmatic knowledge did not involve this structure, post-head act. It can be attributed to the fact that the head act and what prepares the interlocutor to the ensuing request fall in the centre of attention to most of the learners; however, after articulating their request, they do not perceive any need to add anything further. Their attention is focused on the head act and the pre-head act only.

With respect to the post-intervention, she developed the ability to use post head-act modification strategies like those employed by NSs such as the grounders ‘because I am kinda lost’ or ‘I am trying to concentrate’ in more than half of the situations. It seems that she started to acquire post-head act devices and identified their importance in mitigating the force of the request even after expressing the head-act. It can be observed that she relatively marshalled this technique. It could be argued that she has assigned her focal attention to this new feature, post head act strategies, which has been hinged on her previous knowledge of pragmatic features (what appeared in the pre-intervention). Assigning these post-head act strategies in some situations without others may reflect her incomplete knowledge of this feature, she still lacks flexibility with this particular feature. One possible explanation may be that HRAX is in the emergent stage in which some features appear in her ILP, yet they suffer
instability laden with errors and lack flexibility. It is predictable that enhanced learning, fostering these target features should remove variability by time resulting in more stable learning. It is possible that these are the features that she was able to acquire from the given intervention (the input) and therefore the participant extended herself and employed them in similar situations to which they were learned. It can be noted that her ability to use post-head act modification devices was boosted which is most likely to lead her request realisation to become more sophisticated in the future. However, further investigations are required. Cases like HRAX would have given more insights if this present study has examined her delayed post-intervention production.

D. Types of Strategies:
Regarding the types of strategies in the pre-intervention phase, HRAX applied mostly conventionally indirect strategies in most of the situations on the pre-intervention WDCT using interrogatives combined with mitigated-preparatory formulas among others; nonetheless, in situations nos.1 and 5, she employed direct strategies applying imperative in the former and a want statement in the latter. Her inappropriate pragmatic production in these two situations could be set in contrast to her production on the post-intervention WDCT in the same situations in which she resorted to employing interrogative in the past tense, comparable to NSs’ baseline data. Having a tendency towards producing straightforward directives in situations nos.1 and 5 reflects the participant’s inflexible pragmatic ability in spite of the rather elaborate structures that she was able to harness (see previous discussions). She seemed to be able to mitigate her rather direct requests by adding to them pre-and post-head act modification strategies to soften them, in an attempt
to appear polite reducing the size of imposition that might be incurred in realising them as well as removing any possible rejection. Her attempt to secure the face of all parties involved implies her corresponding fairly high awareness of the pragmatic features embraced in the situation as well as the relationship that might be at stake at some point. However, one possible argument could be that this pragmatic awareness does not have a corresponding linguistic ability to allow her to produce wide range of strategies such as the mild and the strong hinting techniques, which rely heavily on insightful use of contextual cues. Therefore, her sociopragmatic competence seems to be well-evidenced, yet her pragmalinguistic ability is still lingering behind.

Regarding her post-intervention responses, she basically maintained her use of conventionally indirect strategies in most of the situations except for situation no. 2, in which she relapsed to using direct strategies where more hedging was required. To illustrate, she used the performative rather than suggestion to indicate her willingness, falling back from native-like production to non native-like production. Similarly, she was found to use want-statements rather than interrogatives in situation no. 3. Along the same lines, HRAX performed less-well in her use of direct strategy to request aid from the technologically skilled student to fix her computer as in ‘I want you to fix my computer’ rather than ‘I was wondering if I can hire you to fix my computer’. No instances of non-conventionally indirect strategies were detected in all eight situations, neither in the pre-intervention nor the post-intervention. One possible reason for this performance is that her pragmalinguistic ability does not include less transparent structures where the communicative intent could not be derived from the linguistic expression. Therefore, it could be easily deduced that the
participant’s strategic ability makes very slight development, but it still needs further enhancement.

E. Stages of L2 Request Development:

On assessing HRAX according to stages of L2 request development (Achiba, 2003 & Ellis, 1992, cited in Kasper & Rose, 2002: 140), there is enough evidence to state that she is oscillating between the unpacking stage no. 3 to the pragmatic expansion one stage no. 4. In fact, she tends to use forms of pragmalinguistic repertoire, with mitigating expressions, incorporating complex syntax. At some point, it seems that she moved from the unpacking stage no. 3 to the pragmatic expansion one even before the intervention, where she employed few characteristics of stage no. 4 in her pre-intervention WDCT; however, the transition is not complete. For example, in many instances she employed extensive modification using a wide range of mitigating expressions; yet in others she fell back to using some formulaic expressions with very limited modification. She employed fairly complex syntax using syntactical downgraders such as conditional clauses, or interrogatives; however, she fully developed her ability to use the past tense only later on in the post-intervention task. It seems that she is ready for more productive use being equipped with a range of request strategies and forms; however, she still lapses in her production. Anyway, HRAX seems to have started from using standard expressions and she is seen to move on forward although her development might be described to be rather slow-paced and hesitant. She appears to have marshalled the required linguistic resources for appropriate language use, yet, she still lags behind in their appropriate assignment, resulting in sociopragmatic inappropriate requests.
On matching the previously mentioned findings of the recognition task of HRAX on the MDCT to this of the WDCT. It could be argued that her performance on the WDCT is *totally aligned* with her recognition on the MDCT. To illustrate, she was found to have plummeted with 10%, scoring 6 correct responses out of 10 on the post-intervention MDCT in comparison to scoring 7 correct responses out of 10 on the pre-intervention one. This deterioration corresponds to her mixed command of her pragmatic abilities as well as her vacillating performance. It can be claimed that she experiences a turning point phase and that her pragmatic ability relapsed after the intervention. One argument might be that this participant is experiencing restructuring, in which new knowledge is pushing the old one and thus re-organisation is occurring leading to some knowledge loss. Accordingly, it can be said that the participant’s recognition is aligned with her production as well (see Chapter 6).
5. Participant YGAX

YGAX represents the outlier segment, a major decline participant. On analysing YGAX’s performance, there were clear indications that her production has witnessed considerable change from the pre-intervention phase to post-intervention one. This can be notably detected in her use of more extensive politeness supportive moves as well as more complex embedded sentence structures in the post-intervention stage rather than that in the pre-intervention, which lacked nuance bordering on to almost brusque requests. Thus, pragmatic failure cannot be ruled out as a possible outcome in such interaction as in ‘sorry, I want to discuss the essay with you...’ in addressing her busy professor. In particular, she was able to incorporate more supportive moves involving a wide range of modification devices in the post-intervention. Another feature that was noted is that she was able to incorporate range of formulaic expressions such as ‘could you...’ ‘would you...’ ‘I was wondering if...’ and the mitigated imperative (please +verb) into her production in about 7 situations in the post-intervention in comparison to her use of ‘can you...’ or ‘could you...’ in the pre-intervention indicating the development of her pragmalinguistic repertoire and her awareness of its governing rules. She became more awareness of the decisive social norms and parameters of the context and situations, producing more sophisticated structures that match those produced by NSs in the baseline data.

However, her production on the post-intervention WDCT seemed to miss some native-like aspects such as her failure to use discourse orientation markers, compliments, sweeteners, appreciation expressions, promise of reward and her limited use of intensifiers. Her production hardly incorporated any post head-act modification devices to downplay the
imposition incurred except for situation no. 3, and almost no lexical upgraders were employed to intensify the urgency of her request, either. Finally, in the post-intervention, communication was never impeded and thus meaning came across easily with no projected pragmatic failure.

A. Pre-head Act:

In her pre-intervention, YGAX started her request with little variety of pre-head modification devices. To illustrate, she employed alerters such as ‘excuse me’ in two situations, ‘sorry’ another two and no calls for attention in the rest of the situations. It seems that she utilised these attention getters only in situations which appeared to be high stake for her as in situations nos. 3, 4, 5 and 8 with her occupied tutor (+P/+SI), her advising professor (+P/+SD/+SI), another student whom she does not know (+SD) and the president of the university (+P/+SD), in order. In her pre-intervention, she hardly used any mitigated-preparatory expressions, compliments, apologies, disarmers, grounders, and pre-commitment indicators. She rushed into her head act straight away in about half of the situations. This pattern may suggest the participant’s restricted pragmalinguistic abilities, in spite of her emergent sensitivity of the potential damage to her interlocutor’s face. It seems that she has consistently overused these markers ‘sorry’ an apologetic marker in an attempt to appear politer by downplaying the assertive voice, in spite of her pragmalinguistic limitedness in many cases if compared to the NSs’. Therefore, pragmatic violations were inadvertently made in most of her production. Her overuse of these politeness markers and apologetic expressions as well as her lack of in other cases reflects her limited pragmalinguistic competence, lack of flexibility, due to which she was not able to use it
wisely apply them based on the situational cues in the rest of the situations. It might be that she overgeneralises the use of certain pragmatic features to make up for the gap in her L2 knowledge of pragmatic conventions (see Ishihara & Cohen, A., 2014). She appeared to have mixed command of the pragmatic aspects of the TL, which requires further refinement for her abilities. It might be that she extends certain structures to context where they do not apply, a quintessential case of overgeneralisation of TL linguistic devices (Ishihara & Cohen, A., 2014).

With her evolving pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic competences that were indicated in her performance on the post-intervention task, she utilised more verbal calls for attention, a variety of pre-head modification devices. It is worth mentioning that pre-head act devices that have emerged in YGAX’s production in the post-intervention task are novel, they were absent in the pre-intervention. The emergence of these new external modification devices in the post-intervention pre-head act made for its complexity, which by contrast seemed fairly straightforward and limited in her pre-intervention. Unlike her pre-intervention, where she inappropriately assigned the apologetic marker ‘sorry’ receded in her post-intervention. This development implies her growing awareness of the assignment rules governing its use, besides the wide range of pre-head act mitigation and external modification techniques that are available at her disposal to downplay the SI and soften the request which might have made for this shift. Her newly acquired knowledge seemed to fill in the previous gap in her ILP knowledge, therefore overgeneralisation recedes substituted by her marshal of the appropriate linguistic resources, requestive strategies. The fact that she used this marker only three times in her post-intervention production, parallel to NSs’ frequency of use,
indicates that she is likely to have picked up other strategies apart from this one which she previously attached to any request. Typical of NSs’ assignment, this strategy was applied to situations nos. 5, 7 and 8. It can be surmised that her pragmalinguistic competence has recovered by raising her attention to the linguistic resources available, making them liable for internalisation and intake together with the sociopragmatic rules driving their appropriate assignment.

B. Head Act:
As for the head-act employed by YGAX in her pre-intervention, she mostly used interrogatives, except for situation no. 3 in which she used the want-statement ‘I want to discuss the essay with you...’. It appears that her sociopragmatic competence played little role in driving her decision to use these head-acts. The situational features hardly played any role in informing her choices of the pragmalinguistic structures. She relied on the formulaic expressions ‘could you’ in in more than half the situations with no discernment to the contextual clues. These unanalysed formulas were invariably used among the situations; however, she tended to place them combined with no or little modification devices and with no pragmatic-sensitivity. She had probably incorporated them in her production randomly as pre-packed structures with little pragmatic expansion. Similarly, her use of the want-statement in situation no.3, she seems to have resorted to this specific linguistic expression ‘I want to...’ by chance rather than according to some informed decision. She employed this direct strategy to express her communicative intent and desire. Another distinctive feature that could be noted in her production is her use of ‘excuse me, could you help me?’ in situation no. 8 which appears to be an opaque directive. This structure does not involve any
pre-head act modification devices from which the interlocutor might be able to infer the meaning. She might have resorted to this opaque structure because she assumed high-stake situation for which her limited linguistic and pragmatic abilities could not cater. Her rather restricted pragmalinguistic resources did not allow her to cope with high-imposition situations. Her use of this head-act request seems to be unparalleled to the requests employed by NSs. Noteworthy to mention, the entire range of interrogatives that YGAX employed in her pre-intervention head-act were never syntactically or lexically modified and supported. With the exception of the politeness marker ‘please’, she neither used if-conditional clause, past tense nor consultative makers, downtoners or hedgers; the same applies to lexical upgraders. She employed politeness marker ‘please’ in situations nos. 1 and 6, which is detected to be mismatch to NSs’ baseline production for this particular situation. It could be argued that she attempted to sound strategically polite using these transparent mitigators and lexical downgraders. Her clear divergence from NSs’ production is likely to suggest that her pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic competences were underdeveloped and that they need to be fostered to become able to achieve her communicative goals and become an active member in the TL community, developing well-balanced communicative competence in the TL.

Regarding her post-intervention head act, YGAX succeeded in utilising range of linguistic expressions to realise head act request including mitigated-imperative head act in one situation, ‘I was wondering if’ paired with if-conditional clause in 2 situations and a past-tense internally modified interrogative. Also, she employed the past tense as a syntactical downgrader to mitigate her request in just above half of her production, which reflects her
reasonable development. However, she resorted to simple directives, such as an imperative in situation no. 1 where familiarity is assumed with her younger brother, a low stake situation (typical of most of the learners). Her preconceived belief that this is a situation that involves familiarity, no age difference was most likely the reasons why she resorted to being more direct and less elaborate in her request realisation. Age is a decisive feature for deference in the learner’s L1 socio-cultural conventions, it is valued more than SD. Thus, it seems that this is an instance of L1 transfer induced error, interference in the TL production where the learner applied her L1 norms in TL context (see Ishihara & Cohen, A., 2014). YGAX might have been unwilling to adopt the L2 pragmatic norms in this instance because they were inconsistent with her L1 cultural norms. This conflict in pragmatic choices was echoed in Siegal’s (1996) and Shively’s (2011) participants. This outcome could be directly compared to Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) findings for the Danish and the German learners in which they deviated from the British norm and followed their L1 norms in the choice of directness of the request in two of the five situations, where these L2 learners resorted to using direct imperatives, while the British used less direct preparatory questions. This shift may suggest that YGAX’s pragmalinguistic competence is evolving along with her sociopragmatic competence, in the sense that she became able to identify the contextual cues according to which she has to make her choices from her available linguistic resources. She used ‘request embedded in complex clause structure I was wondering’ structure in situations nos. 3 and 4 in which +SI and +P were high and SD was low in the former and the latter. It may be claimed that YGAX has developed some sociopragmatic awareness, which might have informed her decision of using rather conventionally indirect strategies. This could be further emphasised with her production in situation no. 8, in which +SI +P were high and –SD was
low, and she employed a mitigated conventionally indirect structure as in ‘would you do me a favour and fix my computer?’ Similarly, she was able to downplay the assertive voice of her request using a pre-commitment and past tense supportive moves. On the other hand, she fell back to less complex linguistic expressions as in ‘could you...’ as in: situations nos. 2, 5, 6 and 7 where –P –SI and SD varies. It appears that she was able to produce expressions similar to those of NSs as in situations nos. 5 and 7, whereas she diverted from NSs’ production in situations nos. 2 and 6. She seems to be unable to produce suggestions for situation no. 2 except for the indirect expressions that she used as in ‘could you design the power point slides?’ with no supporting moves pre- or post-head act of this expression. She seems to mismatch NSs’ production ‘would you like to do the power point slides?’ or I was thinking maybe you want to do the designs for the power point...’. In the same vein, in situation no. 6 where –P –SI were low and the SD was average (fellow-classmate), she resorted to less complex linguistic expression ‘could you lift me home’ with no mitigation before this head act, yet, she adorned it with a grounder in the post head-act. When compared to NSs’ production this head act can be countenanced as an acceptable response; however, NSs normally downplay the assertive voice by the pre-and the post-head act supportive moves. They produce structures such as ‘hi, there! My friend who was supposed to take me home is not here do you think I could ride with you? I will pay you for gas!’ or ‘hey, mate! Fred is not here today so I am stuck for a lift home. Mind if I cadge a lift with you?’, it is bound to have (alerter +grounder +head act +hedgers+ promise of reward) or (alerter +grounder +head act +syntactic downgraders). In spite of the low –SI, –P and the relative SD, the requester has to mitigate his head act directive to mitigate the incurred offense and remove any possible rejection. One possible justification for this mismatch to
NSs’ production, as previously discussed, is that there was some to some extent of negative transfer of her own cultural social norms and values, where the fellow-classmate is assumed to have some low SD. Thus she may think that she is potentially allowed to drop all politeness measures and address him/her directly and assertively. Her use of the indirect strategies with little complexity in the former situations (2 and 6) could be conceivable if they were paired them with some pre- or post-head act mitigation devices, to downplay the force of the request. Her voice was only moderated in situation no 6 but not in situation no. 2 and thus it sounded forceful and imposing, which is not in keeping with the NSs’. In view of this comparison, it could be concluded that she had a mixed command of her sociopragmatic competence and that is why her performance fluctuated at some points where she was found to miscalculate some of the situational cues. Finally, frequent grammatical inaccuracies were detected, yet they never impeded communication and thus meaning could easily come across with minimal impediments. Her learning outcomes reveal challenges in developing grammatical and lexical knowledge together with pragmatic knowledge. Her cognitive abilities seem to be restricted to her pragmatic development leaving little attention to her grammatical abilities progress. Her cognitive faculties could not attend to both abilities together.

C. Post-head Act:

Regarding the post-head act strategies, YGAX in her pre-intervention concluded her request with minimal post-head acts except for situation no. 3, where she used an interrogative to imply some downtoner as in ‘when can I see you again?’ In this situation, YGAX seems to be aware of the importance of downplaying the force of the request by using lexical downgrading
expression as an imposition minimiser supportive move. However, no expressions of appreciation, gratitude, grounder, wrap up, promise of reward, farewell, or religious formula were employed similar to those used by NSs. One possible explanation may be that she is still grappling with her sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic competences.

With respect to the post-head act strategies in the post-intervention, she developed the ability to use post head-act modification strategies like those employed by NSs such as grounder ‘because I want to discuss the essay with you’ or ‘I do not know where is the Engineering building’ or ‘my friend is absent’ in a number of situations. For instance, she employed them in situations nos. 3, 5, and 6, respectively. However, she also lacked the NSs’ post head-act devices of appreciation, gratitude, promise of reward, farewell. Therefore, she is still not able to use the full range available for NSs. One possible explanation could be that the participant is striving to acquire the request the head-act itself, rather than the pre-head act and post-head act, the peripheries. It seems that she is focusing on the head-act only missing these circumferential strategies. Thus, the sequential order of acquisition might have played a vital role in deciding which structure is ready to be acquired first, where the head-act and pre-head act seem to precede the post-head act in acquisition. It seems that the head-act was more salient for YGAX and that is why most progress was achieved in it, followed by the pre-head act where attention getters developed, too. Another interpretation is that she is still lagging in her lexis and grammar, which can be noticeable in her highly frequent grammatical inaccuracies, so that the illocutionary force is accurately encoded in the right forms. Her learning outcomes reveal challenges in developing grammatical and lexical knowledge together with pragmatic knowledge (Safont-
Jordà, 2003). It might be cognitively demanding for her to acquire this part, although this production task is to more or less aligned with her intervention skills, i.e. she received similar strategies in the intervention. Therefore, the novelty of the strategies can be easily ruled out from the reasons that might induce such deficiency in her production. Finally, with reference to Schmidt’s Noticing hypothesis and Truscott’s (1998:108) defiance to it, it seems that YGAX, together with other learners, has consciously attended to the particular details or information to be learnt, the head act and the pre-head act, rather than attending to the whole task or the situation at hand, including the post head at hand. That is why these learners may have internalised these target features that they consciously selected and attended to meanwhile missing others, what they deemed peripheral and out of their noticing. Another plausible interpretation is that post-head acts are not fronted in position so they might be missed as they come in the end of the request. Finally, it seems that learners tend to learn the pragmatic aspects of L2 in a piecemeal fashion, one-aspect at a time (Macrory, 2007).

D. Types of Strategies:
Regarding the types of strategies, in her pre-intervention YGAX applied mostly conventionally indirect strategies in most of the situations on the pre-intervention WDCT using interrogatives paired with politeness markers in two situations only; nonetheless, she employed neither direct strategies nor non-conventionally indirect strategies. Her pragmatic production on pre-intervention WDCT could be set in contrast to that of NSs who employed a range of direct, conventionally indirect and non-conventionally indirect strategies. They employed these strategies compounded with supportive moves in contrast to YGAX who
employed only conventionally indirect strategies and seldom did she use them combined with any of these moves.

Regarding her post-intervention responses, she managed to widen the scope and the range of the strategies she employed. She basically maintained her use of conventionally indirect strategies in most of the situations but for situations nos. 1 and 5, in which she used direct strategy, imperative in the former and mild hinting in the latter. Her strategies’ assignment seems to be based on some raised awareness regarding the sociopragmatic parameters of the context as well as her use of the appropriate requestive linguistic resources. To illustrate, she used the imperative linguistic expression paired with ‘please’ in situation no. 1, where no high stake is assumed. She seems to produce a structure that is roughly corresponding to that of NSs, where she softened this imperative structure; however, more supportive moves such as grounders were detected in the NSs’ production in this very same situation. As for situation no.5, she appears to be employing hinting based on sociopragmatic calculations, where +SD was involved in addressing another student that she is unfamiliar with. Actually, YGAX seems to have noted that familiarity is a decisive feature in driving her decision in which linguistic expression to choose and which strategy to employ. However, there is some counter evidence in her production that alludes to the fact that her learning seems to harbour some gaps; her production fell back in some cases from native-like production to non native-like production. To illustrate, she employed conventionally indirect strategies in situations where hinting was required (compared to NSs) as in situation no. 8. She employed an interrogative request embedded in a clause combined with a pre-commitment device, as in ‘would you do me a favour and fix my
computer?’ Along the same lines, YGAX failed in calculating the contextual cues in situation no. 6 where very little complexity was employed besides the interrogative request where she was addressing her fellow-classmate who was technically under no obligation to give her a ride. Finally, it could be argued that the instance of non-conventionally indirect strategies emerged in the post-intervention WDCT only; however, it was inappropriately assigned. This emerging knowledge suggests that her ability to use more strategies was developed after the intervention. Nevertheless, pragmatic abilities still need further honing in order to be able to employ the correct structure according the TL sociopragmatic conventions.

E. Stages of L2 Request Development:

On assessing YGAX according to stages of L2 request development (Achiba, 2003 & Ellis, 1992, cited in Kasper & Rose, 2002: 140), it can be inferred that after the intervention, she moved up to the pragmatic expansion stage. In fact, she tended to use forms of pragmalinguistic repertoire, with mitigating expressions, incorporating rather complex syntax. It seems that she moved from the unpacking stage no. 3 to the pragmatic expansion one, where she employed characteristics of stage no. 4 in her post-intervention. For instance, she employed a wide range of mitigating expressions in many instances. She utilised fairly complex syntax using syntactical downgraders such as conditional clauses, interrogative; however, she developed her ability to use the past tense in the post-intervention task only. She harnessed politeness supportive moves as well as complex embedded structures.

On matching the previously mentioned findings of the recognition task of YGAX on the MDCT to this of the WDCT, it could be contended that her performance on the WDCT
strictly *mismatches* her recognition on the MDCT. To illustrate, she was found to have declined with 40%, scoring 2 correct responses out of 10 on the post-intervention MDCT in comparison to scoring 6 correct responses out of 10 on the pre-intervention one. This indicates that her pragmatic ability on the MDCT does not reflect her true competence which was reflected in her production on the WDCT. It seems that she used her guessing ability rather than her pragmatic competence to answer the multiple-choice questions of the MDCT, which is a very common shortcoming in the structure of this type of questionnaires. Accordingly, it can be said that the participant’s recognition scores are not aligned with her production evaluation. One explanation might be that the regression of her score on the post-intervention MDCT, which was 2, rather than 6 on the pre-intervention MDCT, reflects some sense of carelessness and thus imprecision. Random error according to Corder (1973, 1975) might also be a possibility, in which the learner is vaguely aware of the existence of certain rules that he/she has not internalised the way they work into her linguistic system. Another tenable interpretation may be the intervention was not motivating enough to keep her focused to the target features and to exert the required cognitive efforts to attain them. A further plausible interpretation might be that the high cognitive demands involved in the WDCT made for her engagement in the task which pushed her to expend more effort and thus produce more pragmatically appropriate language at a higher level of cognition.
5.3. Discussion of the Instructional Effects on the Learners’ Production: Pragmalinguistically and Sociopragmatically Appropriate Production:

The findings of the present study confirm previous research outcomes on the positive impact of pragmatics instruction on the development of the learners’ pragmatic development. It contributes to the growing body of literature on the facilitative role of instruction on foreign language learning according to many researchers including Kasper (1997a); Kasper and Rose (1999, 2002); Rose (2005); Taguchi (2011); Derakhshan and Eslami (2015); and Reza and Alikhani (2016) among others. They equally underscore the vital role and the benefits of instruction on the development of learners’ pragmatic competence. Many of them have focused on requests as a speech act examining it singly or in combination with other speech acts, such as Fukuya and Zhang (2002); Alcón-Soler (2005); Taguchi (2014); Johnson and deHaan (2013); and Norouzian and Eslami (2016). Contributing to previous research, this present study emphasises the effectiveness of two different instructional methods, explicit and implicit as they have been rigorously researched by many scholars including Alcón-Soler (2005); Jeon and Kaya (2006); Takahashi (2010a); Li, Q. (2012); Rezvani et al. (2014) among many others in attempts to arrive at the most effective instructional method(s). However, in the case of the current research an informed eclectic instructional model is pursued.

On reviewing the current research outcomes, it could be seen that quite a large number of the learners demonstrated successful pragmatic ability to identify the contextual cues of the situations according to which they were able to make informed choices from their accessible pragmalinguistic resources. Moreover, they were seen to employ a wide range of strategies that matched those of the NSs in the baseline data, in two positions:
the pre-head act and the within head act. They were able to use almost all subtypes of internal and external modification devices typical of NSs. On closely analysing the data, there were mixed outcomes when it comes to the extent to which learners have achieved gains in relation to both their sociopragmatic competence and their pragmalinguistic competence. With reference to the learners’ sociopragmatic competence development, it is widely believed that it is an ability which involves higher levels of cognitive processing on the part of the learners (Takahashi, 2010a). Therefore, attaining it may come either along with their pragmalinguistic competence or even at a later ensuing stage requiring a micro-level cognitive processing at a deep level. Consequently, it may be impervious to instruction unless certain conditions are secured to facilitate the effectiveness of its learnability. First, explicit intervention was reported to promote its acquisition to some extent providing that it involves some level of deep cognitive processing where the learners are pushed to process the TL features on their own. The presence of equivalent sociopragmatic conventions in the learners’ L1 is likely to foster and consolidate sociopragmatic amenability to instruction (Takahashi, 2010a, 2010b; Shaw and Trosborg, 2000). Finally, explicit reactive feedback including sociopragmatic aspects of the target features could possibly facilitate its sustainability of learning (Takimoto, 2007). These elements were integrated in the present study’s intervention, therefore, the achieved gains in the learners’ sociopragmatic competence are likely to be a result of the intervention which provided them with explicit metapragmatic instruction, L1-L2 comparisons, together with reactive feedback meanwhile the intervention. Finally, the learners’ understanding and noticing of the TL norms and conventions were encouraged producing more appropriate contributions.
Regarding the learners’ pragmalinguistic competence development, the data analysis reveals that the majority of learners were disposed to employ a battery of strategies that matched those of the NSs in the baseline data, in two positions namely, pre-head act and within head act. They succeeded in realising their request using external and a combination of internal modification devices as politeness supportive moves. They managed to use a wide gamut of pre-head modification devices such as pre-head moves including verbal calls for attention, mitigated-preparatory expressions to prepare her interlocutor for the ensuing request, disarming to indicate awareness of potential offence, grounding to give reasons for her request, pre-commitment to try to get others to commit, complimenting to sugar-coat her request, apology to downsize the imposition incurred or for posing a request altogether, cost-minimiser and hedging to get the interlocutor to cooperate, discourse orientation to prepare interlocutor for the coming request, and appreciation to show gratitude, politeness marker, consultative marker, subjectivers, and time intensifier. This outcome is in line with that demonstrated by Martínez-Flor (2008) in which her learners managed to employ all subtypes of internal and external modification devices. Learners in this current study were commonly able to use almost all subtypes of internal and external modification devices employed by NSs. There is other research that has comparable findings to this present study, such as that of Reza and Alikhani’s (2016). Their outcomes concur with this study in which their learners showed an increase of use with a variety of internal and external strategies with appropriate use of these strategies after the intervention.

Other studies were noted to have similar conclusions to this present study to some extent. In fact, Scarcella (1979) and Safont-Jordà (2003) conferred corresponding
outcomes in some respects such as, the types of the modification devices that the L2 learners produced. To start with, Scarcella (1979) came up with evidence of the emergence of some alerters such as ‘Excuse me’ and the politeness marker, ‘please’, suggesting that some of these features might emerge early enough in the L2 acquisitional process. Likewise, it was noticed that Safont-Jorda’s (2003) learners increased significantly in their use of attention getters and politeness markers ‘please’, yet, their grounders and expanders witnessed marginal increase which mismatches the current study’s outcome in this respect. The syntactical complexity that the learners of this study were able to demonstrate could be set in contrast with that of Safont-Jorda’s (2003). Her learners were seen to demonstrate a tendency to employ external modification devices rather than internal modification devices, a disposition which she attributed to the syntactical complexity of the internal modification devices as a target feature. Nevertheless, the present study’s findings could be claimed to partially challenge some of the outcomes revealed by Safont-Jordà (2003). To illustrate, the present study’s learners took that use to a step further in which they were able to use semantic and syntactic modifications within their head-acts. They used lexical modifiers such as their use of the lexical intensifiers to show the urgency of request, lexical downgraders as in their use of hedgers, under-estimators, to name but a few examples. A fairly complex syntax was applied in the post-intervention task, using syntactical downgraders such as conditional clauses, interrogative, and past tense, hence, their requests sounded politer and more tactful. Their usage of this range of mitigating devices was marked with moderate to high flexibility. Their distribution was marked with reasonable precision in which they succeeded to place them wisely with neither over or
underproduction in the general pattern, but with very few outliers. When Safont-Jordà’s study is compared to this present study, it can be seen that the language proficiency, the duration of the instruction, the target pragmatic feature, and the measurement tasks are all comparable, yet the results are partially different. It could be argued that this is the influence of the learners’ L1, Spanish, or that it is the impact of present study’s intervention. This intervention is believed to have involved metapragmatic discussion conjoined with meaningful practice, where negotiation of meaning allows the learners to interact activating and stimulating their TL knowledge until it becomes part of their learning and language system.

As for the studies that were found to have outcomes that diverge from this present study, Taguchi et al. (2015) emerges at top of the list. Taguchi’s findings revealed patterns of change in Japanese EFL participants’ production of requests in high-and low-imposition situations that are different. Taguchi’s participants showed strong development with low imposition requests but almost no gains with high imposition (see previous discussion for contrasting outcomes). Syntactic mitigation, hedging and amplifiers were noted in immediate post-test and a large portion of it was maintained at delayed post-test given 4 months later. When comparing the present study’s findings with these of Taguchi et al. (2015), it could be contended that this study’s participants achieved more even gains with reference to both the discourse level and the linguistic level to encode their pragmatic intentions. On the other hand, Taguchi et al.’s learners showed steady progress on the discourse level but not on the linguistic level strategies. In fact, her learners did not seem to demonstrate comparable gains in lexis and syntax on encoding their pragmatic intentions with precision. Areas of
mitigated-preparatory expressions (I wonder if you could...) is one of the areas that revealed no progress with reference to Taguchi et al.’s participants (2015) also internal modification hedging as in ‘possibly’ and amplifiers as in ‘really’, which were found to be used with 50% by NSs. Taguchi et al.’s participants were noticed to use please+ direct imperative+ strong modal (should)+ direct expression of dislike (I do not like...) which is likely to bring about pragmatic failure or at least some social tension. According to Belz and Kinginger (2003), Fukuya and Zhang (2002), and Hassall (2006), this inadequate performance can improve by modelling corrective feedback which fosters deeper cognitive processing whether proactive or reactive feedback. Underpinned in Schmidt’s (1993,1995, 2001) Noticing Hypothesis, explicit feedback is believed to foster pragmatic development. This outcome is believed to be in striking contrast with the findings of this present study in which this study’ learners demonstrated apt use of modification devices with relatively high frequency, reasonable flexibility, and acceptable levels of precision. One interpretation of this evident difference might be that this present study harnessed the learners’ noticing and attention to these pragmatic features with diversity of means in the intervention via input enhancement, metapragmatic explanation conjoined with meaningful practice, consciousness raising awareness techniques in which L1-L2 difference was highlighted in certain areas along with reactive feedback. The importance of noticing in instruction has been reiterated in the literature where saliency has been promoted through explicit explanation and communicative activities for practice which can facilitate the pace and the degree of learning.
Another outcome that the present research unfolds is in relation to the directness of the strategies that were employed in the request realisation, a large number of the learners were revealed to use a variety of direct, conventionally indirect, and non-conventionally indirect strategies in realising their requests, even mild hints were observed in some learners’ production in the post-intervention WDCT. However, it could be stated that there is a general tendency to rely heavily on conventionally indirect strategies, when they were addressing their request to their equals or people who were in higher positions. However, when requests were addressed to people at lower positions, they were indexed with a tendency towards using more direct request strategies in realising their request without mitigation, expect for few cases. Very few learners were noticed to combine their requests with modification strategies to downplay the assertive voice. Ogiermann (2009, cited in Shcherbakova, 2010: 8) echoing Lin (2009) reports “conventionally-indirect requests remain the safest strategies in English for potentially face-threatening situations”. This outcome is in line with Blum-Kulka et al. (1989), CCSARP, in which conventionally indirect strategies appeared to be the most commonly and frequently used across languages to realise requests, where they realised that among the four language that were under investigation. This heavy reliance on conventionally indirect strategies as an outcome can be compared to the EFL learners of Rose (2000), Achiba (2003), Umar (2004), Félix-Barsdefer (2007), Aribi (2012) and this present study. One plausible interpretation might be that these learners relied on this strategy as a safe alternative to avoid being forceful, imposing or coercive in their request. They intentionally overgeneralise this pragmatic features in all contexts which signals gap in their knowledge as far as the appropriate and conventional context of assignment. Therefore, the learners’ pragmatic knowledge seems to be missing this
organisational feature of which contexts to restrict its application. Hence, learners sought this risk-free alternative compromising precision by applying it to all context with no demarcation. Finally, the majority of the learners’ performance was marked with absence of mild and strong hints, non-conventionally indirect strategies except for very few learners who were noted to employ such strategies such as FYAX, NEAX, YLAX, SBAX, EHAX, PTAX, and NOAX. However, our learners were inclined to use only mild hints rather than strong ones when they were addressing their superiors or when the size of imposition was assumed to be high (+SI/+SD).

In spite of the fact that there was a tendency to use more indirect strategies in situations that involved high level of imposition and power, social distance was not deemed to be a decisive socio-cultural factor in some cases. There was an exception where some learners were seen to miscalculate the contextual clues of some situations in which they employed directness with people to whom they assumed casualness and familiarity whereas it is likely to incur communication breakdown or at least some social tension (Félix-Barsdefer, 2007; Fukushima, 1990, 2003; Safont-Jordà, 2003). They employed directness in cases where they were addressing their classmates and acquaintances who are not their friends, assuming closeness and friendship. Stereotyping, stigmatisation, and communication breakdown are possible results in such cases (Dong, 2016; Eslami-Rasekh, Z. et al., 2004; Kasper, 1981). This may be attributed to the learners’ inability to use the appropriate structures with the people at lower social positions because they are challenged as far as their sociopragmatic competence is concerned. They were not able to adopt the TL appropriate conventions and values of use to calculate the SD, P involved typical of NSs.
This can also be traceable to the learners’ L1 socio-cultural background negative transfer, where the TL norms and values were supposed to be adopted in such cases. According to the learners’ L1 cultural norms such conventions are believed to be creating some affection, assuming closeness that does not really exist, whereas in the TL cultural norms, it might be taken as rude and imprudent (Nelson et al., 2002). The learners appear to have bridged this gap in their knowledge by directly transferring their L1 socio-cultural conventions and values (interference) in a context where they do not fit yielding inappropriate requests and awkward communicative patterns. It seems that the learners defaulted to their L1 socio-cultural rules to solve this linguistic problem and address their subordinates or people they assumed to be at a lower position using language that is likely to bring non-compliance in case they are communicating with NSs, communication breakdown. To illustrate, many learners mismatched NSs in situation no. 7, the waiter situation, where a large number of the learners assumed social superiority over waiters and thus addressing them entails little politeness strategies. This misjudgement is believed to stem from some faulty assumption that it is the waiters’ job to serve their guests and thus little effort should be put to mitigate their requests. This perception might be part of some L1 circles; however, it is not part of the polite circles’ perception where politeness should be adhered under all circumstances. Therefore, some learners were seen to follow these politeness conventions in addressing waiters.

Along the same lines, Salmani’s (2008) findings showed parallel outcomes in which his Persian learners rarely employed direct request in situations where there is a big social distance between interlocutors, whereas they tended to frequently use direct request in
situations, where there is no social distance. Salmani (2008) attributed this outcome to the assumption that it is as if they had a potential for expressing camaraderie and friendship, an attitude that is well acknowledged in the eastern culture as opposed to the western one. Based on these findings, it can be concluded that this pragmatic feature seems to be resist acquisition because of the L1 socio-cultural norms. Learners should be advised of the potential problems of such behaviour. However, this together with the previous findings indicate that there are many target features in pragmatics can be taught. These features may improve as a result of effective pragmatic instruction (Taguchi, 2015; Takahashi, 2010a). It is likely that pragmatic instruction may raise the learners' awareness of the target pragmatic feature and thus they become noticed and thus they may become intake from the input (Schmidt, 1993, 1995, 2001).

In the same vein of the employed level of directness of the strategies, there is another plausible interpretation that might be the reason behind these learners' diverging from the TL norms when addressing their subordinates or the ones lower in ranking. It might be argued that these learners were intentionally reluctant to adopt the TL cultural patterns in such situations and that is why they relied on their L1 cultural conventions to perform the requests. It is likely that they rejected to put the TL norms into play in these situations simply because they realised that these norms do not conform to their own cultural norms, i.e. they have to employ language that would degrade them socially or at least it would index them as socially equal to waiters, etc. This interpretation is comparable to the findings revealed by Siegal (1996), in which his learner preferred to diverge from the TL conventions deliberately, because these norms (Japanese culture and the woman status in this culture) were
considered to be at odds with her L1 norms and what she perceives herself to be. In addition, as for the learners who were not able to deal with their equals and who resorted to overtly indirect structures to realise their requests, these learners seem to suffer from pragmalinguistic deficit in which they relied heavily on formulaic expressions. They lacked the variety of linguistic structures with which they can realise their requests with their equals meanwhile adhering to some politeness techniques.

These findings are in line with Umar’s (2004) findings in which he has come up with similar results concerning his learners’ dominant preference to use the conventionally indirect structures as well as the direct requestive strategies with people in lower ranks or positions. This similarity could be attributed to L1 interference in which the learners use their L1 norms to evaluate new situations in the TL context (Reza and Alikhani, 2016). It appears that they failed to notice the contextual cues that should have referred them to incorporating politeness techniques with people with lower position. However, his findings were a bit different from the current study’s outcomes in some respects, because Umar’s learners were noted to employ fewer semantic and syntactic modifiers than their NSs counterparts, yielding request realisations that seem less polite and less tactful. Nevertheless, the learners of this present study were able to demonstrate ability to employ wide range of semantic and syntactic modifiers pre-head act and within the head act in general, and in few case post-the head act strategies emerged. This difference could be attributed to the kind of intervention that was administered in this present study, whereas in Umar’s study, the learners received no instruction to manipulate their production and modify it to match those of NSs. In fact, the necessity of pragmatic instruction is underscored with Umar’s
confounding findings. A further difference could be noted in the fact that Umar’s learners were never detected to use hinting or more opaque structures, likewise the learners of this present study. His learners’ pragmatic competence seems to be lagging behind that of NSs. Nevertheless, mild hinting emerged in the current study, though it was rather restricted in scale. This outcome mirrors one of the findings of Reza and Alikhani’s (2016) study, where the occurrence of the non-conventionally indirect strategy witnessed only marginal increase after the intervention though it was expected to appear with a high frequency after the intervention. The infrequent occurrence of this strategy can be traceable to the demanding nature of non-conventionally indirect strategies at the linguistic and contextual levels (see Alcón-Soler, 2005, 2007).

A less frequent trend that was noted in our findings was that the learners were noticed to overproduce the politeness marker ‘please’ with very high frequency as the one and only mark of politeness, which does not match the production of NSs. This is a typical overgeneralisation of TL perceived norms, according to Ishihara and Cohen, A. (2014), where certain structures are extended to contexts where they do not apply. In addition, others seemed to underuse hints and suggestions, very few learners employed any of these opaque mitigation devices. One reason for the overproduction of ‘please’ might be that it is a discrete semantically and syntactically defined flexible chunk which the learners can internalise with relative ease and move around as a politeness marker in any part of the request. Another reason is likely to be the learners’ lack of precision with reference to the restricted occurrences and distribution in which the use of this marker is deemed appropriate. It is in my belief that the learners’ pragmalinguistic limitations
(being a member in EFL context) is responsible for their lack of flexibility in production, in which learners lag behind with a dearth of TL input and exposure to a model for the appropriate production. Correspondingly, their deficient sociopragmatic competence accretes which is likely to lead to their lack of precision (Taguchi, 2015; Martínez-Flor, 2004; Kasper, 2001). These learners experience very few opportunities for exposure as well as for use and practice of the TL in meaningful communicative interactions (Brock and Nagasaka, 2005). With reference to their underuse of hints and suggestions, hints are opaque structures which meaning cannot be induced from its literal surface meaning, therefore it seems quite intriguing to many learners (Weizman, 1993). It needs deep processing to arrive at its interpretation and meaning where no one-to-one meaning is represented, and hence it cannot be easily processed and internalised in L2 learner’s language system. Another interpretation that might be plausible is that the learners might have inferred from the available TL input that hinting was restricted to very few marked situations in comparison to commonality of conventionally indirect strategies. The high frequency of the conventionally indirect strategies is likely to have pushed the learners to notice and thus learn the most commonly applied strategies at the expense of the less frequent one, strong and mild hinting. Further investigation is warranted to ensure hinting becomes integrated in L2 Learners language system and more automatically retrieved. Henceforth, it could be contended that noticing played a vital role in the learners’ learning.

Another noteworthy outcome that the results disclosed is that numerous learners, though it seemed a lesser trend, were able to employ expressions of appreciation, sweeteners, or
promise of reward as post-head act supportive moves. However, others were disposed to give peripheral attention to the post-head act strategies, embracing no or minimal modification devices in this position. A Multitude of the learners were noted to produce highly elaborate structures in the pre-head act and the within head act, with complete absences or partial expansion to the post-head act. One plausible interpretation might be that the focal attention of these learners is directed towards the salient elements in the input, which according to their preconceived concepts would be the head acts and the openings of the requests. These learners tend to place their focal attention to these two components giving their peripheral attention to what comes after that. This seemed to lead to better learning and intake to the elements that received attention only without the other components that received no or less attention. It could be argued that post head act supportive moves were not very salient, therefore the learners were not able to notice them and thus cognitively internalise them for future use. This outcome emphasises Schmidt’s Noticing Hypothesis (1993, 1995, 2001) in which what is noticed is liable to be internalised. Another explanation might be the position of post-head act, where it comes after the main head-act which is the centre of attention and thus the learners fail to notice anything that comes after it. It seems that the learners’ attention gets diverted to the prime piece of knowledge, when their concentration is at its maximum and they overlook whatever comes next assuming it to be peripheral or of no importance. They become satisfied with the pre-head act and the head act and many of them were not able to move beyond this point. Another tenable interpretation might be the impaired pragmalinguistic ability prevents them from using language structures extensively before and after the head act, the focus of her
attention. Therefore, further investigation is warranted to explore the reasons behind the learners' failing to acquire this bit of knowledge.

A case in point, the idiosyncratic case of HRAX, she developed an ability to use post head-act modification strategies like those employed by NSs such as politeness markers and grounders in number situations, in spite of the fact that she fell back in her head act strategies. It appears that HRAX was able to employ 'please', a transparent mitigator as well as grounders. To her, grounders marked negative politeness, because they explain that the learner would not impose something on the hearer unless she has strong reasons, semantic concepts that are easier to develop in comparison to other syntactical structures (Brown & Levinson, 1978: 133). According to Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis (1993,1995, 2001), what is noticed is likely to become intake. This implies that it is the learners' selective attention is what picks up what might or might not be learned. The learner's attention is purposefully focused on the peripheries rather than the head-act. That is why instruction has improved her ability to improve the circumferential rather than the head-act. It might be the learner's agenda for learning was incompatible with that of the teacher where HRAX focused on one bit of knowledge rather than the other.

Regarding the stages of L2 pragmatic development that the learners were assigned to with reference to Achiba (2003) and Ellis (1992), the majority of the learners were noted to be at the pragmatic expansion stage. It is contended that this might be attributed to the positive impact of pragmatic instruction. Such gains were manifested in the majority of the learners' ability to move from the unpacking, stage 3, to the pragmatic expansion stage, stage 4 in a
5-stage series. In fact, most of the learners were disposed to employ wide range of mitigating expressions, use forms of pragmalinguistic repertoire, incorporate rather complex syntax with complex embedded sentence structures. The majority of the learners were able to utilise syntactical downgraders such as conditional clauses, interrogative, and the past tense. A large number of the learners demonstrated characteristics of stage no. 4 in their post-intervention WDCT. In few cases some learners such as FYAX moved to stage 5, fine-tuning, the final stage on the scale of L2 pragmatic development. A full command of use of wide range of mitigating expressions was seen in many instances as well as a fair command of complex syntax was identified among the majority of learners.

A further outcome that is worth noting is the incidental learning that happened within the study. No learner opted out from producing requests or leaving a blank space for a request rejoinder, in fact all learners contributed fully in filling out the MDCTs and the WDCTs (compare with Rose, 2000). This could be attributed to the fact that the learners were well-prepared for the cognitive demands and the skills that were involved in the instructional outcomes measures, the MDCT and the WDCT within the intervention. It appears that they were able to transfer the skills developed by the intervention into a new situation and context. This suggests that the learners might be able to use these very skills later on in their future in their further learning and they may purposefully build on them.

According to Taguchi (2014: 34), she attests that “instructional effects vary substantially depending on the demands required in the assessment tasks”, be it MDCT or WDCT in which MDCT was deemed less demanding as a recognition task (receptive skills) in
comparison to its production counterpart. As for this present study, the learners were required to contribute to one receptive assessment task, MDCT, and two other production tasks, the WDCT and the diaries in which the learners’ cognitive demands are deemed high and challenging. This might be an indication to the robustness of their learning, which enabled them to perform these cognitively high demands tasks.

The findings of this present study are in line with that of Mirzaei and Esmaeili (2013), in which they were set out to investigate the impact of explicit instruction on EFL learner's awareness and production of three speech acts of request, apology, and complaint. Their results showed significant gains made by the experimental groups receiving instruction supporting the view that explicit metapragmatic instruction in speech act patterns, rules, and strategies facilitates interlanguage pragmatic development. Hence, consciousness-raising can be influential in acquiring pragmatic competence. Similar to this present study, they examine instruction in pragmatics in EFL contexts. They lend support to the fact that pragmatic instruction has a facilitative role in pragmatic competence as evaluated via the learners’ pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic competences.

5.4. Conclusion:
One of the aims of the study was to examine the role of instruction in pragmatics on the learners’ production of when an utterance is or is not pragmatically at odds with the TL expectations and norms of behaviour. The WDCT findings of this present study further support for the facilitative role of instruction in pragmatics on the foreign language learners’ production pragmalinguistically and sociopragmatically. It further suggests its inclusion in the language learning settings especially in EFL classrooms where learners do not acquire appropriate usage of the TL naturally or due to scarcity of TL input and exposure. It is
reckoned that the pedagogical intervention is the primary access to EFL learners (El Okda, 2010).

Pragmatic intervention employing explicit-implicit methods of instruction (see Chapter 3) seems to be effective. It has raised the learners’ awareness and noticing to the target pragmatic features and thus the learners’ pragmatic abilities and competence has been fostered allowing them to produce pragmatically appropriate utterances according to the TL norms and conventions. As for the learners' voice and attitudes, the third perspective of the learners’ language development, and the third aim for this present study, the following chapter aims to analyse the learners’ voice on the self-reported diaries in an attempt to come up with the general pattern and the most common tendencies among the learners.
CHAPTER 6
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: Learners’ Attitudes Towards the TL Learning Experience

6.0. Introduction:
Turning to the third set of data (the diaries), this chapter aims at summarising the data that were collected from the learners’ self-reported diaries. It embraces a fine-grained analysis of these introspective diaries using qualitative approaches, and grounded theory (Silverman, 2016; Charmaz, 2014; Glaser and Strauss, 2009). This part is limited to exploring the learners’ attitudes towards the TL learning experience during and after the pragmatic instructional intervention. To get deeper insights into language learners’ inner thoughts, self-reported diaries are an effective method to investigate the learners’ attitudes: beliefs, emotions, and behaviour.

The data for this chapter were collected by means of four diary entries that were sent to the teacher-researcher throughout the period of the intervention. They include four diary entries, which were gathered from each of the 45 learners making a total of 180 entries. These diaries are an endeavour to keep records of the learners’ voice and chart their burgeoning awareness and learning of the pragmatic aspect of the TL. They are grounded in the learners’ internal and external dialogues as well as the discussions they had been engaged in throughout their language learning experience. These diaries are the direct source of the data that are quoted in the coming sections. These quotations are not meant to be comprehensive of all the gathered data because of the space constraint; however, they are meant to be representative of all the detected patterns. The data were annotated, coded and organised in accordance with the research question under investigation as well
as the recurring themes and patterns. The content analysis provided insight into the learners’ attitudes towards the TL learning experience including affective factors as well as motivation.

Research Question 3: What are the learners' attitudes towards the TL learning experience after the pragmatic instructional intervention?

The third research question (above) focuses on the learners' attitudes towards the TL learning experience during and after the pragmatic instructional intervention.

6.1. Summary of the Four Diary Entries:
In the following sections, an overview of the diaries will be offered. The quoted extracts are only representative, and they are not meant to be comprehensive of the whole data, as previously mentioned. Nevertheless, selection was made with a view to responding to the research question completely and the experimental work discussed earlier. It is beyond the scope of the study to enter into discussions of the individual psychology of each and every learner separately. What is reported is illustrative of the most common themes that emerged, paying special attention to certain uncommon cases. All extracts are unedited; hence, they may include many grammatical, typological and structural errors. These errors were overlooked to maintain the credibility of the data. However, in some cases the diary entries were shortened to fit in the space constraint.
6.2. Diary Entry Number 1
A set of three questions has been used to solicit these diary entries. The entries are directly related and applicable to the learners’ attitude towards the TL and their language learning experience. The first question (see Appendix C) attempted to outline the learners' observations and insights about their own language learning experience. It investigated their perception of whether learning some pragmatic features may promote their understanding of the TL. It sought to examine their desire to learn the functional component of the language. The second question delved into the learners’ attitude towards the learning situation including materials that were provided. Finally, a comparison between the TL culture and the learners’ own L1 culture was brought to the learners’ attention using the third question in which the learners’ awareness of the cultural difference between their L1 and the TL, learners’ identity was touched upon as well.

On reviewing the learners’ records in the first diary entry, with a total of 45 logs, two key patterns of interpretations were identified. To start with, the learners were noted to develop either a positive attitude towards the language learning experience or a positive attitude that was tinted with a tone of negativity, anxiety or discomfort. No purely negative attitude was detected in the first subset of these data. The learners tended to develop attitudes with variable levels towards the whole experience including the TL, the material, the facilitator, and themselves as language learners with in-depth insights of the reasons for their own progress or deterioration towards ultimate success in the TL.
To begin with, the language learning experience was a key element that was alluded to in almost all logs. It could be strongly inferred that there is a resilient tendency for the learners, roughly 40 learners out of a total of 45, to develop a positive attitude towards the whole experience. They communicated their *positive attitude towards the learning experience* (the researcher’s personal emphasis) with statements such as (see Appendix M: Table 1: Diary number 1, Extract 1). With closer inspection of these extracts, SBAX’s diary suggests that she developed positive judgments concerning this new experience. She used encouraging words and phrases such as ‘innovates, keen to move forward, huge privilege, helps, etc.’, which reflect her inner sense of satisfaction with her individual language learning process. The originality of the experience seems the source of this supportive opinion, a cognitive component of attitude. It provided her with promising expectations concerning her ultimate success in the TL, because it seemed to have actively engaged her. Above all, it has also bolstered her self-confidence. Harnessing a positive attitude is deemed a necessary condition to determine and sustain motivation, a precondition to a learner’s success or lack of in language learning experience (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2013; Gass & Mackey, 2012; Brown, 2007; Noels *et al*., 2003). It has been widely reported that attitudes play a vital role in the learners’ adopting L2 standards for linguistic action (Locastro, 2001:70).

Similarly, NMAX found this experience both ‘interesting and eye opening’. She developed this encouraging state of mind and inner feelings as a consequence of her perceiving the experience to be enjoyable and insightful. It appeals to her affectively and cognitively: keeping her actively engaged and feeding her intellectual faculties.
Likewise, NBAX maintains the same sense of satisfaction towards the language learning experience. He seems to have liked ‘the classes’ because they were ‘enjoyable’, emotionally appealing, as well as ‘productive’, intellectually and cognitively constructive. He seems to have made positive judgments that are both affective and cognitive about the experience, evaluative and cognitive components of attitude. Bearing in mind that it has been widely reported that attitude is one of the key predominant factors for the success in language learning (Brown, 2007; Noels et al., 2003). Brown (2007: 193) believes that "positive attitudes toward self, the native language group, and the target language group enhanced proficiency". Correspondingly, Noels et al. (2003: 36) claim positive attitudes may make the experience more conducive to language learning because the “learners can be expected to want to be able to communicate with native speakers of the language they are learning.”

However, this was not necessarily the case. These previously mentioned comments were in few cases detected alongside expressions of resentment to the TL or combined with expressions of anxiety about using the TL altogether. For instance, these very few learners showed a sense of bitterness towards the TL bemoaning a negative past experience or anticipating potential embarrassment before their fellow-learners and teacher. To illustrate, they displayed their negative feelings in comments such as (see Appendix M: Table 2: Diary number 1, Extract 2). SEAX’s diary extract suggests that her linguistic self-concept was subject to painful anxiety, despite her admiration for the classroom learning experience she praised in the beginning of her entry. Her vulnerable self-concept seems to stem from a traumatic past classroom experience. This
considerable damage to her linguistic self-concept needs to be rectified before it gets into the way of her language learning as a possible affective barrier. It is likely that this adverse feeling may have a negative impact on her participation in any promising language learning experience, unless her self-concept is encouraged (Rhalmi, 2009; Horwitz et al., 1991; Bailey, 1983). Stakeholders such as, practitioners, researchers, teachers, educational institutions administration and shareholders need to pay careful attention to these deleterious sentiments. In the same vein, EHAX’s extract communicates the anxiety she endured. Her exceedingly reduced control over situations where peers and NSs ‘made fun of’ her or ‘patronised’ her seems to have resulted in her loss of self-esteem. Her traumatic experience nurtured her sense of anger, frustration, and ultimately isolation which may result in her mental and physical withdrawal. Thus, it is likely to impede her language learning and communication unless action is taken to support her to instil and recover her self-confidence (Horwitz et al., 1986; Cohen, Y. & Norst, 1989). It is in my belief that a skilled, sympathetic and encouraging facilitator/teacher may work out situations like these efficiently and promising results may be achieved on the long-run.

Moving to the TL, a large number of the learners expressed their encouraging attitude towards the TL expressing their desire to learn the TL, their liking it, their enjoyment on interacting with its NSs, and their holding high value of it. Several key statements were denoted in the diary extracts highlighting these themes as in (see Appendix M: Table 3: Diary number 1, Extract 3). The extract drawn from HRAX’s diary suggests that she desires to learn the TL. The purely instrumental orientation of motivation she expressed
in her willingness to embrace one of the cultural products of the TL, English fiction, implies that she has positive feelings towards the TL. Accordingly, it is expected that this learner entertaining this favourable feeling and being highly motivated to do so is likely to achieve well in her language learning experience (Kecskes 2013; Dörnyei, 2012; Gass & Mackey, 2012; Brown, 2007; Masgoret & Gardner, 2003; Locastro, 2001; Gardner, 1968, 1991). Gardner's (1985: 10) socio-educational model refers to motivation as “the extent to which the individual works or strives to learn the language because of a desire to do so and the satisfaction experienced in this activity.” It has been widely reported that harnessing an encouraging attitude towards the TL is a good start to learn an L2. However, HRAX embodies a distinctive pattern, one that is counterintuitive. On reviewing her profile, her MDCT results depict that she was not able to achieve well; in fact, her success in the recognition task seemed to decline by 10% (see Chapter 4). Maintaining the same pattern of deterioration, on analysing her WDCT results on the pre-and the post-intervention stages, it can be detected that her performance did not show any considerable improvement. In fact, she declined in her performance in more than half of the situations except for susceptible improvement in limited respects in a couple of instances. In spite of high motivation, her performance tended to be generally modest. Her reduced performance could be attributed to her misunderstandings about the nature of foreign language acquisition and that she needs to review them. Her diary extract indicates her lack of self-confidence as well as her over self-consciousness, ‘I can't rise my voice confidently because I'm afraid of my pronunciation’. She seems to overestimate her articulation errors communicating. Overestimation and over self-consciousness are substantial affective barriers to
language learning. Misunderstanding her own IL besides having affective filters at play are plausible reasons for her failure to progress in her language learning experience (Du, 2009). Her case might capture a quintessential instance of the complex ebb and flow of motivation (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2013: 397). She might be harnessing variable levels of motivation at different points of time in her language learning experience which by default may impact the amount of effort that she expends (Dörnyei, 2003).

Maintaining the same desire to learn the TL, MSAX’s words reveal positive feelings towards the TL. She demonstrated her feelings towards it saying ‘always’ and ‘love the language’. She explicitly expressed her liking the TL itself, a possible facilitative feeling (evaluative component of attitude) in language learning. In the same vein, the diary extract of ZHAX illustrates her encouraging feelings towards members of the TL community. She expressed her pleasure and desire to have a direct contact with TL speakers, such as her meeting and communicating with members of the TL community. It is expected that learners with this high level of motivation readily interact with TL group and consequently they achieve better in their language learning (Gass & Mackey, 2012; Gardner, 2007; Masgort & Gardner, 2003).

In the previous examples, these learners discussed their favourable attitude towards the TL, which could be set in contrast to the few who expressed their negative attitude towards the TL. There were other learners who bore this contrasting attitude. They manifested their resentment to the TL early enough, in week 2, with statements that were unequivocally noticed in their diaries (see Appendix M: Table 4: Diary number 1,
Extract 4). EHAX communicated her anger towards the TL using words like ‘angry’ instead of milder expressions, such as to express her feelings of dissatisfaction, frustration and aggravation. However, she managed to explicitly discuss the reasons behind her frustration and that she experienced it temporarily, which facilitated her managing and overcoming these issues at some point later on. Similarly, DAAX expressed her ambivalent affective reaction towards the TL, where her adverse feeling can be inferred from expressions such as, ‘never feel comfortable’, relatively angry. Consequently, it is likely that the development of language learning is hampered. Finally, SHAX communicated her negative attitude towards the TL via her expression of apprehensions towards its community members. She employed an adjective like ‘cunning’ to describe the NSs of the TL. She unequivocally expressed her personal goals, instrumental orientation of motivation, to attain the TL in spite of her negative feelings towards its speakers assuming them to be cunning and that she needs to keep herself ‘safe from their cunning’. Her willingness to adopt the TL is particularly sensitive to her personal goal, maintaining her self-protection. She used a religious quotation to sustain her personal belief about the TL community, supporting her argument. Accordingly, SHAX’s perspective provides her with disposition to certain behavioural actions, one of the components of attitude. Her negative attitude towards the TL, an evaluative component of the learner’s attitude, might make language learning more difficult if not impossible (Gass & Mackey, 2012; Gardner, 2007; Brown, 2007; Masgort & Gardner, 2003). Consistent efforts need to be exerted on the part of stakeholders and teachers in order to manage this negative attitude as it will cause barriers to effective language learning. Identifying and understanding the frustration and the discomfort that
some learners suffer from is a necessary step especially in foreign language context with little or no exposure to TL community to rectify it (Shankulie, 2012; El Okda, 2010; Brock & Nagasaka, 2005).

Another key feature of the learners’ attitudes is their opinion regarding the materials that were employed in the intervention, a large number of them expressing their satisfaction and admiration. They tended to be pleased with the authenticity of the materials as well as the expounding techniques used in presenting them, i.e. video showing, input enhancement technique, and the interaction involved in the communicative activities provided. It seems that the materials appealed to many learners due to numerous reasons. On reviewing the diaries of the learners, authenticity of the material seems to play a vital role in capturing the learners’ attention and engaging them (see Appendix M: Table 5: Diary number 1, Extract 5). FSHAX’s diary extract suggests that she has been diligently identifying and seeking her preferred learning environment. She is aware of the potential advantage of authentic materials over contrived ones in promoting successful language learning. With clear awareness of what it takes to become competent in communication, the ultimate goal of L2 learning, it is clear that authenticity and the use of authentic language is imperative for successful language learning (Shankulie, 2012; El-Okda, 2010). What intensifies this need is the fact that foreign language learners have scarce opportunities for exposure and practise in the TL, hence employing authentic materials will serve many purposes for foreign learners (Shankulie, 2012; Brock & Nagaza, 2005; Bardovi-Harlig, 2001). Along the same vein, NOAX shares the same opinion about employing authentic
materials, illustrating how NSs communicate with each other based on the hidden social norms that learners are hardly exposed to in traditional textbooks (which account for the majority of the available textbook) (Barron, 2016; Salazar, 2007; Crandall, 2004; Boxer & Pickering, 1995). She pinpoints the fact that she was able to see what speakers actually said, not what they were supposed to say, and thus the learners’ interactional needs are finally met. Above all, it is worth mentioning that authentic materials are widely believed to be inherently more interesting than contrived ones because of their intent to communicate a message rather than highlight the TL (Shankulie, 2012; Brock & Nagaza, 2005; Bardovi-Harlig, 2001). Using authentic materials promotes the learners’ motivation, which would possibly have its positive bearings on their language learning and acquisition (Gass & Mackey, 2012). Enjoyment of authentic materials has important pedagogical implications. Foreign language learners prefer real life language and situations rather than the distorted TL situations of traditional textbooks, which are deprived of examples of implicit language that can never be communicated in these books (Barron, 2016; El-Okda, 2010; Salazar, 2007; Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; Vellegrna, 2000).

Furthermore, these materials seemed to appeal to some of the learners because of the techniques that were utilised in illustrating them, such as, *video showing and input enhancement technique* according to Alcón-Soler (2005); Fernández Guerra, (2008); Martínez-Flor (2008); Dastjerdi, and Farshid (2011). They communicated their remarks on the materials (see Appendix M: Table 6: Diary number 1, Extract 6). On reviewing SBAX’s diary, it shows that she has developed insightful beliefs about language
learning processes and effective teaching/learning strategies in the classroom and the contexts beyond that (O’Malley et al., 1985). She was able to identify the importance of integrating multimedia-teaching aids to boost learners’ engagement as in: ‘feeling excited and enjoying’. She adds that incorporating these videos is inspiring since they break the boredom of the classroom activities and they add to the learners’ engagement (Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015; Zangoei & Derakhshan, 2014; Rose, 2009; Fernández Guerra, 2008; Jernigan, 2007, 2012; Sherman, 2003; Mayer, 2001). They intensify learners’ interest in their learning and they boost their motivation, providing them with more complete and vibrant image of the interlocutors and the setting, as well as information about gestures, which in turn leads to more pragmatic awareness and learning (Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015). Multi-media enhanced teaching may foster memorisation and retention of linguistic items, memory-processing techniques (Zangoei & Derakhshan, 2014; Jernigan, 2012, 2007; Alcón-Soler, 2005, 2007; Bradshaw, 2003; Brinton, 2001; Canning-Wilson, 2001). SBAX indicates that it may facilitate language learning using their multiple sensory components; in turn, it is considered a contributing factor (Ching & Fook, 2013). Expectations of success are reinforced as well as high motivational levels, and thus success in language learning experience is likely to be realised (Dörnyei et al., 2014; Dörnyei, 2012). Similarly, AMAX expressed her contentment with the provided materials. She described them as ‘helpful’, because they satisfied one urgent need that she had, to be able to ‘interact’. They familiarised her with some of the hidden social norms, the TL societal attributes and expectations. With clear evidence of the learner’s desire to converge with NS and to become informed with their social expectations, AMAX will expend much effort to achieve success in her language
learning task. She had positive feelings toward the materials, simply because they help her approach success in the TL. They provide her with the full range of details that she requires to attain control over the situation. She can identify the interlocutors’ tone, a functional aspect of the TL, which gives her deeper insights into the hidden social rules of the TL (Savignon, 2007). They help her to approximate NSs’ production according to Alcón-Soler (2005, 2007); and Fernández Guerra (2008).

On a different note to the supportive attitude towards the materials, MAAX highlights in his diary entry the importance of manipulating the TL input by emboldening some key words and features. He was able to identify the significance of this visual enhancement feature using the bold face to direct the learners’ attention to the TL structures (Gass, 2013; Han et al., 2008; Sharwood, 1993). This outcome thus provides definite support for Schmidt’s Noticing Hypothesis (1993, 1995, 2001), which states that conscious noticing is a necessary condition for changing input to intake, internalising TL target features.

Moreover, using original and interactive activities as well as the video showing technique seems to have had a great influence on engaging the learners (Fernández Guerra, 2008; Martínez-Flor, 2008; Alcón-Soler, 2005). Some of the learners expressed their contentment with expressions (see Appendix M: Table 7: Diary number 1, Extract 7). MSAX expressed her clear desire for more creativity as motivating factor that is likely to facilitate her own language learning experience. To her, the creativity and originality of materials improves the learners’ engagement and it is likely to encourage them to
expend more effort in the task at hand. She experienced a positive attitude toward the techniques employed as she engaged with ‘new things’ and assumed ‘achieving’ her task of language learning this way. The originality of the tasks encouraged learner participation and engagement, a good start for their success.

On a different note, NTAX mentions her preconceived model of language learning, as one that is employing ‘media and interactive activities’. She described these techniques to be ‘encouraging’ in the classroom context and beyond that in other unfamiliar contexts, extending her learning outcomes beyond the context of learning. NTAX was able to express the drawback of dully presented materials that deter from the learners’ engagement and participation and thus might work as a barrier to learning. Using interactive materials that are enhanced with multimedia seems to capture the learners’ attention and engage them (Alcón-Soler, 2008b; Fernández Guerra, 2008; Martínez-Flor, 2008). She envisages a bright prospect as a consequence to her employing multimedia-enhanced materials and group work activities (one of Gardner’s multiple intelligences: interpersonal intelligence, Gardner, 2006 as cited in Roberts, 2013). She assumes that these materials and the interactional activities are likely to instil and boost the learners’ self-confidence, which in turn would support their success and achievement. NTAX was able to identify one of the attributes of community language learning in which learning in a community works as a moderating factor to reducing their language anxiety, a possible barrier to their success (Rhalmi, 2009; Koba et al., 2000; Horwtiz et al., 1991; Bailey, 1983).
On the other hand, very few learners made comments on the level of complexity of the materials, though one expressed his concern that (see Appendix M: Table 8: Diary number 1, Extract 8). NBAX endorsed a statement about the complexity of the materials. He seemed enthusiastic about the materials, yet he remarked on its complexity. He thought it might be challenging for some fellow-learners and that the materials need to be ‘lowered to an average’ level implying that they are above average student. NBAX’s apprehensive attitude towards the materials reflects sincere willingness for success and achievement. In fact, he never mentioned himself to be included in facing this challenge, he directed his comment towards his fellow-learners whom he thought might be challenged missing the conceived benefits of the materials. It also imparts the growing sense of self-monitoring and that he starts to take the responsibility for his own learning. He attempts to evaluate the attributes of the learning context including the material. His emergent awareness indicates that he is growing engaged through active learning, he assumes success. It could be argued that NBAX embodies an active member among a group of learners (security circle) who aspire at experiencing more non-threatening social dynamics within the classroom with convenient materials and manageable learning objectives.

This comment is very insightful with reference to lowering the language anxiety of the learners and in relation to boosting their receptive skills. However, it might be contended that learners’ need to be encouraged to push their learning an extra mile. They need to receive ‘comprehensible input’ and knowledge that is slightly ahead of their current state of knowledge in order for learning to happen (Krashen, 1985). It needs to be ‘slightly
challenging’ but not ‘too challenging’ for them. According to Krashen (1985), learners need to receive input that would be useful to them, neither identical to nor way ahead of the current state of knowledge. He adds too much anxiety may contribute to the learners’ affective filter inhibiting and debilitating their own learning (Du, 2009; Horwitz et al., 1991; Krashen, 1981, 1982, 1985).

Regarding the facilitator (teacher-researcher), quite a large number of the learners expressed their sense of comfort if not appreciation to her. The diaries suggest that they tended to be satisfied with the non-threatening environment; she was able to create in the classroom. Her considerable support, encouragement and patience may have helped in engaging them, boosting their confidence as well as managing their anxiety levels. In turn, these attributes may have aided their language learning experience instilling an encouraging attitude in them (Horwitz, 2001). It also may have enhanced the efficiency with which the learners approached their goals. They expressed their satisfaction with the non-threatening environment, a context conducive to learning, using expressions such as (see Appendix M: Table 9: Diary number 1, Extract 9). FHAX refers to the social context that was set up by the facilitator as ‘friendly’. It seems that she was able to appreciate the importance of a stress-free context in facilitating her language learning experience. Freedom of expression and test-anxiety free context are two learning-facilitative factors that she identified. According to her diary entry, these factors played a facilitative role in her language learning experience by ruling-out or alleviating stress which may have detrimental consequences and undesirable bearing on her learning. Creating a low-anxiety classroom atmosphere seems to be one of the
exigent needs identified by some of the learners, FHAX included. It appears that the learners are growing more cognisant of the attributes that pay off for their ultimate success in language learning. It has been widely reported that stress could impair effective learning (Horwitz, 1986, 2001, 2016; Benson, 2013; Cohen, A., 2011; Ellis, 2003, 2008). A context that is laden with stress is unlikely to yield positive attitude (remote possibility of effective language learning). Language learning contexts should make use of manageable levels of anxiety to motivate students to expend the required efforts, rather than provoking anxiety that inhibits their progress with reluctance and hesitancy. Similarly, SBAX has entertained a positive attitude towards the facilitator. She commented on her keenness to show up in these classes and her burgeoning motivation. She credits the facilitator for the creation of this enthusing atmosphere, attributing her sense of eagerness and motivation to the teacher’s qualities simply because she held her responsible for winning their confidence right from the beginning. Once the facilitator wins the confidence of her own learners, she becomes able to bolster their motivation and self-esteem, two necessary attributes for their success in language learning. The facilitator inspired them to manage their own learning with the necessary fine-tuning and readjustment.

However, this was not always the case, anxiety was sometimes evident. A small number of cases expressed their endurance of niggling anxiety towards evaluation, such as test-anxiety declaring their apprehension from being assessed. One learner stated,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSAX</td>
<td>“but I was just scared that the exam may come harder”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MSAX expressed her test-anxiety, fear of failure due to poor performance. Learners can be easily intimidated by critical feedback to their erroneous performance. This instance signifies that teachers, practitioners, and researchers should pay sufficient attention that evaluations and exams should not have an undesirable impact on language learning. In fact, learners’ awareness should be raised concerning the objectives of exams as well as their benefits and interest should be created in them as formative assessment tools. Equally important, teachers should be advised to recognise signs of overly competitive learners, which may lead to language anxiety. Harbouring negative attitude towards exams and formative assessment is likely to impede effective language learning.

This negative feeling may also cause intimidation – especially with reference to the learners’ summative evaluation. Another learner expressed her fear of errors and peer-judgment as in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASAX</td>
<td>“I am working on improving my English so please excuse me if there is any grammar mistakes.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In his diary entry, ASAX expressed his diffidence and fear of being publically exposed before strangers or her fellow-learners. Self-consciousness is an anxiety-evoking instance in which the learner becomes hyper sensitive to his own mistakes to the extent that he avoids using the TL altogether and indulges in more reticence. Concerns about how these mistakes may be perceived by peers besides the possibility of his looking or sounding ridiculous before others including his teacher may provoke tremendous anxiety. Teachers should be advised about the manner of error correction and most importantly how often to give this as constructive feedback. They should be sensitised
that some error correction is essential; however, the manner should not be patronising for the language learners’ self-esteem. A desire to attain the teacher’s approval warns against possible mental or physical withdrawal of the language learning experience if they surmise this goal is not partially or fully achieved, teachers have to detect such patterns early enough to avoid losing their learners. They should help them with tolerance and counselling reinforcing their self-confidence and their linguistic self-efficacy. That is why the teacher-researcher worked on removing any possible influence that she might have on the learners’ responses. Typical to practitioner research, she tended to be non-obtrusive yet facilitating their emerging L2-mediated identity.

Turning to the language learners’ insights, many learners assessed themselves against many points of reference. These indicators included their discernment about their own linguistic abilities (self-concept), their ability to take the responsibility of their own learning (autonomy), and their ability to value the functional aspect of the language. Some learners had communicated in their writings encouraging evidence of positive self-assessment whereas others had expressed negative self-assessment involving variable levels of confidence in skill areas as well as indication of harbouring different levels of anxiety regarding their language skills (Cohen, A. & Macaro, 2007).

On reviewing their diaries, the records suggested the learners’ predisposition towards embracing positive self-Assessment which was detected from the encouraging expectations of success they had from this experience as well as their willingness to
invest more efforts. They expressed their **positive self-assessment** with expressions such as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learners</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEAX</td>
<td>“I’ve learned something and it only the beginning”;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAX</td>
<td>“I think after 4 weeks or less we will see improvement in our language”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEAX revealed her strong willingness to expend more effort in her language learning by stating that ‘it only the beginning’ unfolding that there are more efforts to be exerted in the future. Her desire to put more effort despite of the preliminary gains that she has already achieved illustrates her sense of evolving progress. This feeling is bound to bring about more success with more initiatives and resolution for achievement (Kecskes, 2013). Foreseeing encouraging evidence of attainment motivates learners to expend more effort, a necessary attribute for ultimate success. Likewise, ABAX reported comparable opinions and feelings like these of NEAX. She claimed detecting encouraging evidence concerning her performance with rather an underestimation of the task difficulty. It appears that the learner-preconceived model of ‘language improvement’ is reasonable, not with high expectations. That is why she senses possible improvement within quite a short period of time, ‘4 weeks’. This underestimation may be the impetus for expending more effort on the part of the learner to fulfil such a manageable objective. Otherwise, it may bring about detrimental language learning outcomes on facing the gap between the unrealistic, unreachable expectations and the possibly disappointing outcomes. Therefore, giving learners manageable tasks in reasonable framework of time could be impetus for them to expend more effort foreseeing encouraging learning outcomes as stepping-stones for ultimate success.
Moreover, some learners’ records reflected on the possible opportunities for self-
revaluation and expression in public as opposed to some learners; intimidation as in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEAX</td>
<td>“My language is better now”;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAX reports her positive attitude towards the estimation of her linguistics abilities. She holds a positive belief about this experience, which in turn encourages her to reconsider her own abilities. This approach has a positive impact on the learner’s level of motivation, pushing her to expend more effort and consequently, more success to come on her ultimate achievement.

On the other hand, some learners have demonstrated some sense of negative self-
assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OKAX</td>
<td>“I am not good at the English language”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike this promising attitude some learners are inclined to hold the opposite opinion and belief, OKAX included. She evaluated her own linguistic abilities as ‘not good’. She is disposed to mark down her own linguistic value, which might act as an affective barrier impeding her language learning altogether. Changing or alleviating this adverse self-assessment can have a facilitative role in this learner’s language learning experience. It is deemed necessary that any unfavourable feeling should be rectified otherwise it can have a negative impact on attainment (Dörnyei et al., 2014; Hosseini & Pourmandnia, 2013; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2013; Oroujlou & Vahedi, 2011; Dörnyei & Schmidt, 1999).
In addition, some learners’ entries expressed their high level of anxiety inhibiting them from any prospects of public performance as well as their fear of skills erosion in various situations and with a variety of expressions. They stated that they could not take the risk of public-performance before their fellow-learners with expressions fraught with negative emotions as in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learners</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HRAX</td>
<td>“but when it comes to speaking…I can’t rise my voice confidently because I’m afraid of my pronunciation…so maybe I have the fear of speaking English in public”;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHAX</td>
<td>“fluent Arabic speakers, made fun of me and patronized me when I tried to speak”;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HRAX reported on her inability to raise her voice as a clear indication that she is suffering unmanageable levels of anxiety. With her belief that pronunciation is her weakest skill and beyond her achievement, her lack of self-confidence and her great concern about her poor pronunciation (her own self-concept) may act as an impediment to her successful language learning. This misconception discourages her from participating in fluency-focused activities. It goes to the extent that she cannot even raise her voice, a sign of physical withdrawal from the language learning context. Language-fear and anxiety is an affective boundary that is likely to debilitate her language learning and frustrate her attempts for acquisition altogether. It is advisable to identify these affective filters and barriers early enough in order to rectify and cater for them in the language learning experience (Du, 2009).

Fear of being patronised or made fun of is another example of language-ego at stake. EHAX emphases the notion that affective barriers are impenetrable for language learning. They deny language learners valuable opportunities of language learning despite their high levels of motivation. Learners tend to stumble with these
psychological barriers that are invisible to teachers and sometimes to learners themselves. Learners’ awareness needs to be raised concerning their own psychological barriers so that they can deal with them effectively and in a timely fashion.

Fear of loss or reduction of self-esteem, fear of having their inadequacy exposed resulting in loss of self-esteem and being placed in inferior position before their fellow-learners seem to have negative bearing on their language learning. It is likely that these learners be intimidated and that they would never try themselves out using the TL. Therefore, it is highly recommended that the facilitators should identify these learners and they should attempt to alleviate their anxiety and distress (Bledsoe & Baskin, 2014). Hosseini and Pourmandnia (2013: 63) state, “the amount of the anxiety of the learners in foreign language learning situations may account for the changes in motivation of language learners (Johnson & Johnson, 1998) and ultimately changes the students’ positive attitudes.”

Moving to the learners’ autonomy, some learners demonstrated their ability to take responsibility of their own learning. They made judgments concerning the techniques that may promote their language learning and make up for any gap in their knowledge. They mentioned statements in which they expressed their language learning philosophy and beliefs that governed their behaviours as in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learners</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTAX</td>
<td>“we have to practice listening and speaking to be able to make conversation with anybody”;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMAX</td>
<td>“I suggest to talk in English and read more and to make projects to help us to improve our language”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In her diary entry, NTAX reflects her knowledge about the most effective strategies for success in language learning with a preconceived image of the best language learning model. To her, practising listening and speaking are central for language learning, a blend of receptive and productive skills. Being able to set her own goals ‘to converse’ and work towards them reflects her initiative, taking the responsibility for her own learning, becoming autonomous, a good start for success in language learning. NTAX regards that exposure, as a learning strategy, is learning-conducive and that it enhanced her self-confidence and lowered her levels of anxiety (Ellis, 1989).

In the same vein, SMAX also gives her account for what may improve their language learning making it easier, more enjoyable, more self-directed, and thus more effective. She reckons speaking and reading are the two skill areas that need attention as well as employing group work activities (interpersonal intelligence, Gardner, 2006). To her, they are the most effective strategies for success in language learning (Cohen, A., 2011). Her ability to decide on what makes for the best for attainment highly reflects on her independence as language learner, one of the attributes of the autonomous learner (O’Leary, C. 2014).

Some learners went further trying to explore the reasons behind their failure in their language learning. They assumed some reasons regarding the scarcity of opportunities that they had for exposure to and practising the TL come on top (El Okda, 2010) as in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learners</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FHAX</td>
<td>“we suffer the lack of practicing the language due to our life style”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWAX</td>
<td>“I admit that i am shy, i get restless to talk in English because I have not used it but i work to face this problem”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lack of practice was one of the features that had negative bearing on language learning. According to FHAX’s report, she identifies her lack of practice in the TL to be one of the impediments to language learning. Opportunities for practice are widely reported to be a decisive factor in ultimate success in language learning.

Shyness is another feeling that may have had a negative impact on the learners’ language learning experience. MWAX reports on her sense of diffidence to perform using the TL as one of the reasons behind her lack of success so far. It seems that she became autonomous enough to oversee her own learning process and to contemplate the reasons for her failure. She monitors her own performance and probes into the adverse effects for her struggle. She is inclined to blame it on her lack of practice ‘not used to it’. She is motivated enough to work this problem out, however. The ability to identify her diffidence as a ‘problem’ and her willingness to invest effort to resolve it implies that she is on the right track for ultimate attainment and self-regulation (Kecskes, 2013).

Other learners reported on their ability to discern the language skills that are required to improve their own language competency. They develop self-awareness regarding language learning and acquisition. This is likely to enhance their language learning and facilitate their development.

Moving to the learners’ awareness regarding the importance of the functional aspect of the TL. The learners’ diaries suggest that a moderate number (almost half the learners) became sensitised to the functional aspect of the language and that some
others did not. They are resolved to observe the conventional perception of language learning and acquisition as a set of vocabulary and rules that need to be memorised in order to be used with an accurate pronunciation (Richards, 2006). Some learners had their awareness regarding the miscellany of cultures raised whereas others assumed faulty identical matching between their L1 and the TL (Zufferey, 2015; Safont-Jordà & Alcón-Soler, 2012; Martínez-Flor & Uso-Juan, 2011; Bardovi-Harlig, 2010; Alcón-Soler & Martínez-Flor, 2008; Bardovi-Harlig & Dörnyei, 1998).

Some learners appear to come to grips the concept of the miscellany of cultures. They became familiar with some of sociopragmatic aspects of the language, they reported on the emergence of this knowledge as in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learners</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AWAX</td>
<td>“if you are polite you are more likely to achieve your objectives and get what you want also people are more likely to deal with you”;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTAX</td>
<td>“For me knowing the culture of every country you speak its language is much more important than keep on learning the language only as it makes it easier to socialize with people”;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to AWAX, she underlines the fact that politeness is an indispensable factor in achieving your communicative goals. Identifying this universal rule of politeness while grasping that the way of realising it differs from one culture to the other paves the way for noticing the gap between L1-L2 cultures. It is only when the learners notice the mismatch, the gap between L1-L2 cultures that they attempt to bridge this gap by attaining the social norms of the new culture. Similarly, NTAX highlighted her growing awareness concerning the diversity of the cultural social norms and thus practices that govern language learning (Zufferey, 2015; Ishihara & Cohen, A., 2014; Rose, 2005). She expresses her ultimate goal of being able to socialise with NSs, thus she needs to
acquire the hidden social norms as well as the linguistic make up of the TL. Learners need to acquire both competences in order to avoid sounding rude or uncooperative.

Few learners *misconstrued the diversity of cultures*. On comparing the TL to their L1, they missed noticing the gap between the two cultures. They sought to transfer the social norms from one culture to the other. They expressed their beliefs as in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YGAX</td>
<td>“[the two languages] are nearly the same, the situation of the polite and impolite way are the same in our language”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In her diary, YGAX expressed her belief about the perfect alignment of the two cultures, L1 and the TL. The seemingly similarity of some of the communication patterns of both culture was misconstrued. It made her fall under the impression that she can easily transfer the cultural values and norms of one community to the other, a fact that is likely to lead to communication breakdown if not pragmatic failure. Her willingness to compare her L1 to the new language cultural norms is likely to cause her to notice the mismatch at a later stage of her language learning process. YGAX might be attempting to test a hypothesis that she had already constructed, the perfect alignment between her L1 cultural norms and that of the TL. This might work as a step towards her noticing the gap between her L1-TL or her own forms and the TL forms in order to later reflect on her own interlanguage and learning and repair the misconstrued features (Swain’s Output hypothesis, 1993) (Mackey, 2002; Mackey *et al*., 2000). Following this path, it is likely that YGAX would be able to co-construct pragmatic knowledge and rules, solving this linguistic problem. YGAX’s diary extract can be cross referenced compared to her performance on the MDCT and the WDCT. It appears that her recognition does not match her diary entries, where she attempts to decipher the
social norms of the TL. She attempts to identify the hidden social norms of the TL by building on her current knowledge, her L1 social norms. To illustrate, regarding her performance on the MDCT, she fell back in her recognition task in the post-intervention MDCT, where she deteriorated with 40% in her recognition. She scored 2 in the post-intervention in comparison to 6 in the pre-intervention (see chapter 4). It may be construed that her heuristics, which she highly expended in completing the MDCT, have failed her. Another plausible interpretation might be that her misconstrued similarity between her L1-L2 is likely to have pushed her to 'linger longer' in a certain stage of her language development rather than develop her own learning (Lightbown & Spada, 2006). In other words, assumed L1-L2 similarity is expected to invoke stagnation in TL language development. However, her performance in the production WDCT reveals a jaggedness of her profile which reflects on her current stage of testing hypotheses and ruling out the defective ones, coming up with conclusions about her own learning. YGAX performed better in her post-intervention WDCT, nevertheless her performance needs further honing to her pragmatic abilities in order to be able to employ the correct structure effectively according the sociopragmatic norms and the contextual cues. Her belief that the cultural social norms of both cultures are the same is a step in a long process of learning that is ahead of her. It widely believed that some learners attempt to learn the language either by comparing it to their L1 or by fitting it to the pre-fabricated framework that they have constructed in their learning experience, testing their own hypotheses and applying them. It might be that her rich foundation of universal pragmatics system, her L1 pragmatic knowledge within her native culture, gave her an edge (Mey, 2001). Being familiar with the concept of requesting or the communicative event itself as part of her own linguistic system is likely to facilitate her pragmatic abilities in the TL.
Kasper and Rose (2001) attest that pedagogical interventions can sensitise learners to the useful pragmatic features that they currently know and encourage them to use their universal or transferable L1 pragmatic knowledge in L2 contexts (Al-Issa, 2003; Wierzbicka, 2003; Yu, 1999). However, Bialystok (1993) counter argues that having this pre-existing pragmatic knowledge might act as an extra taxing burden with which the language learners have to address and control with the help of pedagogical intervention which plays a significant role on purposefully manipulating this knowledge.

It was reported in the diaries of some learners that they were able to notice the importance of the **functional aspect of the language**. They expressed their emerging new perspective of language and language learning as in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learners</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NMAX</td>
<td>“I realized that English language is way far from grammar and punctuation…making a request is much more than asking for the request itself, there is more into it. It is a strategy full of steps and structures so that the person in front of you will understand you completely and won’t be offended by the way you asked or won’t repel from you”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMAX</td>
<td>“I think it’s very helpful and interesting at the same time, it taught me what is the meaning of the social distance between people and if they have power over each other or not”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NMAX used to hold the misconception that English mainly and only involves grammar and pronunciation disregarding the functional aspect of the language. The current project seems to have at least partially challenged this preconceived notion by raising her awareness. Giving value to one aspect of the language in favour or at the expense of the other is a previously held misconception that needed to be demystified by close attention to the different facets of the language. Language teachers and stakeholders need to show the importance of these facets in facilitating successful communication. Having succeeded in realising this facet, NMAX seems to have gained more confidence in her language abilities.
In keeping with the same concept, AMAX expressed her positive attitude towards acquiring the functional aspect of the TL. She was able to identify the different parameters that are involved in making a decision on which linguistic structure to use, with whom, etc. Attaining this knowledge is likely to enhance language learning with its ultimate goal, successful communication. It is expected that learners' awareness with the functional aspect of the TL should yield better communication with NSs of the TL.

This is not necessarily the case, however. Some learners were not able to focus on the functional aspect of the language; they would rather focus on the grammatical-structural aspect rather than the functional one as in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learners</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MWAX</td>
<td>&quot;showing video let me know the correct pronunciation&quot;;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAAX</td>
<td>&quot;the best way to improve our accent and to gain more new words&quot;;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSHAX</td>
<td>&quot;even if our accent is really poor or not up to scratch i'm positive by the end of the semester it'll be convenient&quot;;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NMAX and AMAX, MWAX reported on their language-preconceived beliefs regarding how to learn a language. Their notions about what involves language learning are likely to impact their effectiveness in the classroom where they are expected to expend effort according to their beliefs or opinion. MWAX seems to be giving value to pronunciation rather than other aspects of the language. Although, this kind of knowledge is of course valuable and it is highly relevant in communication situations, MWAX tended to overestimate pronunciation as if it were the sole linguistic dimension of the TL. Focusing exclusively on this linguistic/structural dimension, as the ultimate goal for attainment might be tricky in some cases. Native-like pronunciation might not be achievable due to
fossilisation issues or other acquisition-related problems; in turn, it might hinder the success of the language learning process.

Along the same lines, other learners including DAAX and FSHAX hold the belief that learning inventories of vocabulary words and grammar rules is the most essential part of language learning. Therefore, most of the learners' time and effort are invested in memorising vocabulary lists and grammar rules at the expense of other language learning activities. Learners who hold this belief about what makes up language learning only attend to the structural element of language at the expense of fluency-related activities. They become inclined to withdraw mentally and physically from communicative-centred activities. They focus on accuracy and overestimate their errors provoking high and unmanageable level of anxiety that may impede their ultimate success.

It seems that assigning their undivided attention to the structural aspect with special focus on pronunciation is what is preventing them from trying themselves out in the TL. Their focus on the structural aspect of the language may be the result of the classical methods of teaching that have been adopted in Egypt and most of the Arab World, in which focus on grammar and pronunciation make up for language learning and acquisition. Their fear of errors is one outstanding barrier that may impede their language learning and distract them from the main purpose of the study -the role of teaching pragmatics in FL context.
6.3. Diary Entry Number 2

The following diary insights have been elicited by a set of questions related and applicable to the learners’ attitudes towards the TL as well as their motivation. The first question (see Appendix C) has attempted to scan the ways in which the learners’ enjoyed or disliked meeting and listening to people who speak TL. It has investigated the learners’ interest in learning TL. The second question has probed into the reasons behind their willingness to learn the TL, if it was deemed applicable. It has examined the gains that might be achieved on learning the TL. Data gathered from these entries have been analysed in terms of learners’ attitude towards the TL as well as their desire and motivation to learn it.

On reviewing the learners’ entries in the second diary entry, with a total of 45 logs, two key patterns were identified. The vast majority of the learners were interested in learning the TL. They expressed their active involvement in the language learning experience, in which each learner examined his/her own reasons for his/her individual desire to acquire the TL. Another key pattern that was noticed is that all 45 learners, with no exception, were noted to be motivated with various degrees to learn the TL, for one reason or another. They had the desire and they were ready to expend the required effort to various levels. However, in spite of being motivated to some degree, some learners appeared to struggle with their learning. Consequently, they tended to investigate the barriers impeding their progress coming up with insights of the conceivable reasons behind their deterioration towards ultimate success in the TL.
This present study adopts Gardner’s (1985,1988) framework which posits that motivated learners realise success because they have the desire to achieve the goal of learning the language and that they expend more effort in achieving it (Cigan, 2014). That is besides their adopting favourable attitudes towards learning the language.

Driven by variable purposes, numerous learners had the desire to attain the TL. Quite a large number of them, if not all of them, expressed their desire to master the TL for one reason or another. They explicitly stated their motives as in (see Appendix M: Table 10: Diary number 2, Extract 1).

On reviewing the diary entries, it could be easily detected that all learners were disposed to be motivated to attain the TL. They appear to associate their expectations of success with myriad of goals that they can achieve on attaining high levels of foreign language skills and abilities (Cigan, 2014). A small number of learners were selected to display the range of motives, which the learners presented for their attitude towards attaining the TL. Basically, all learners expressed their openness and willingness to communicate with the TL speakers. To start with, some learners highlighted the better job opportunities they can secure, foreseeing more employability, or that at least, they might be able to further their careers. Other learners showed interest, because they were willing to travel overseas to stay or work or study, showing readiness to interact with intercultural partners with special interest in on international affairs or business and trading. Quite a large number of the learners expressed their interest in the TL cultural products such as: books, fiction, films, music, TV shows, and media in general. Some
others concentrated on exploring new sciences and ever-developing technologies with special focus on computers and electronics, film industry, aviation, and above all, adventure. Fewer agreed that it is essential to master a foreign language for sports and sports-related affairs as well as other activities and professions, which required full or at least partial mastery of the foreign language. Some learners thought of attaining it as a source of international pride holding it with high esteem, acquiring a prestigious language that has its international value worldwide, a lingua franca as some learners referred to it (House, 2009; Alcón-Soler, & Jordà, 2007; Jenkins, 2006). Others viewed the whole experience as a source of challenge. Fewer expressed their earnest passion for the TL itself in its own right, almost 5-10% of the learners expressed their explicit affection to the TL as a system they need to master. Finally, MTAX, NAAX, FHAX, and HRAX are just a few among many others who thought that it is indispensable to attain a foreign language to have better life opportunities acquiring a window to social integration in a globalised world.

However, this was not necessarily the case. In spite of their sincere desire to learn the TL, and with their full determination to override any barriers that may hinder their progress, a few learners faced some of the affective hurdles they were caught in as in (see Appendix M: Table 11: Diary number 2, Extract 2).

Some learners’ self-reports relay that they held some preconceived notions about themselves and their language learning experience that are likely to have a deleterious impact on their progress (Du, 2009; Cohen, Y. & Norst, 1989). Embarrassment, over-
concern about accuracy, fear of public-performance, anxiety, alienation, lack of comprehension and fear of skills erosion are some of the affective hurdles that learners identified in their diary entries. To illustrate, some of them, including ABAX, thought they might not be competent enough in grammar or that they lacked sufficient awareness of the cultural norms, a model of reduced linguistic self-concept (self-efficacy). They seemed to be substantially over-concerned about their grammatical accuracy as well as their pragmatic competence, afraid of making mistakes in public. Particularly, ABAX shunned interaction in public and communicative activities to escape the probability of being publically exposed, precipitating more reticence. Furthermore, SMAX is another example of learners who harboured niggling anxiety concerning their linguistic abilities. Owing to this overriding sense of nervousness and self-consciousness, SMAX appeared to be deterred from communicating with NSs and again language learning was compromised based on affective barriers. Similarly, NHAX presents an even sharper instance of a learner who suffers fear of public-performance, particularly in the classroom context. He communicates his sense of anxiety and irritation because of the potential opportunities of public-performance and exposure before his fellow-learners, marking them 'kids'. He reckons them as inferior to him labelling them with their limited experience, fewer abilities, and younger age ranges. In addition, he uses the word 'hates' to express his emotions towards using the TL in public, which denotes anger. He seems to hold negative beliefs about the classroom environment, which is likely to impede his progress in the TL. His apprehension of being publically exposed in addition to his lack of self-confidence hinders him from actively participating in the classroom communicative activities and thus promoting his skills and abilities. It appears that his
negative emotions towards the classroom environment pushes the learner to withdraw physically and mentally from engaging in activities requiring public performance, communicative activities (Hosseini & Pourmandnia, 2012; Horwitz, 1990). This learner, among other similar cases, embodies instances where affect poses a barrier to language learning progress. His reticence and shunning of using the TL hinges on his perception of his peers being inferior. On a different note and with more pressure placed on her to perform better, EHAX seems to experience a different sentiment, isolation. With closer examination of EHAX’s diary entry, it could be stated that she suffers from painful seclusion due to her inability to communicate fluently in the TL. She perceives her isolation as springing from the fact that she cannot interact effectively and efficiently with her friends and fellows. She seems to be denied valuable opportunities to socialise due to her limited linguistic abilities and her reduced self-efficacy in the TL.

Laden with negative emotions including fear of public-performance and apprehension of being publically exposed before their fellow-learners and above all NSs of the TL, practising and using the TL in authentic real-life situation poses a psychological obstacle and a mental burden on these learners. The affective barriers they seem to face tend to debilitate them, witnessing high and unmanageable levels of anxiety and intimidation (Scovel, 1991; Horwitz et al., 1986). These instances of anxiety and intimidation were prompted by misconceptions and prejudices; however, learners appeared to be able to identify these barriers efficiently. These learners should rid themselves from these preconceived notions and prejudices in order to pave the way for successful language learning experience. Teachers, practitioners, and stakeholders are
held accountable too; they should be sensitised to the adverse beliefs and notions that learners hold so that they can aid them offering them support.

There were several key features that were noticed to have debilitated or facilitated the learners’ language learning experience; among these features are the affective barriers (the aforementioned discussion), as well as other preconceived conceptions and beliefs. Moving to other preconceived notions about language learning, which is the learners' **predetermined conception of the difficulty of the language learning task**. Some learners were noticed to overestimate the task difficulty, whereas others tended to underestimate it, one of the features that are likely to promote or curb the amount of **effort** that the learners expend. Regarding the learners who underestimated the task difficulty, they said (see Appendix M: Table 12: Diary number 2, Extract 3). On studying NAAX's diary, it is conspicuous that she **underestimated the task difficulty**. It seems that she is using a self-regulating strategy in which she is underestimating the task to encourage herself to expend more effort (Cohen, A., 2011; Chamot, 2004). She sets success in language learning as a manageable and achievable goal to invite success, a possible outcome to her efforts. This could be set in contrast to unattainable goals that some learners adopt sometimes to work out as a pretext, self-protecting excuses for their failure and poor performance. She expects the task to be easy, to assimilate it with manageable and attainable goals, a self-encouraging strategy that is meant to bring about success only if employed wisely. Similarly, PTAX holds the same attitude towards the difficulty of the task. She, along with HLAX and ZHAX, deems the TL learning to be a simple and congenial undertaking that requires no arduous chore. Their estimation of
their ability to cope with the task will have an impact on the amount of effort they expend which will, in turn, have an impact on their success. However, it might be counterproductive if the learners exploit this notion to the extent that they take the task lightly and thus they do not expend the required effort. Therefore, holding beliefs concerning the task difficulty might be facilitative or counterproductive depending on whether these beliefs are taken in sensibly (Ellis, 2008).

However, there were a few other learners who thought otherwise. They had the propensity to *overestimate the difficulty* of the task of language learning. These learners communicated their concepts as in (see Appendix M: Table 13: Diary number 2, Extract 4). On examining HHAX’s diary entry, it could be easily stated that he overestimated the task difficulty. HHAX expressed his opinion about the complexity of the task at hand, in anticipation of the amount of effort that needs to be exerted. This belief might be conducive in encouraging him to strive all the more and put some extra efforts into achieving his set goals, to attain the language. However, if this opinion is taken too far, to the extent that the learners would see their language learning task as a target that is unattainable and unmanageable, that might be counterproductive and intimidating. It might deter them for attempting their goals altogether employing this handicapping pattern of behaviour. Therefore, the learners need to be sensitised to the fact that they need to use their discernment to evaluate the task difficulty incisively.

Moving to some distinctive features that were detected in the learners’ diary entries, some learners bestowed some exceptional behavioural patterns. Being a social venture,
language learning involves the **learners’ identity** including their developing an ‘L2 identity’, incorporating new elements from the new culture such as new social and cultural norms together with its system of rules and grammar along with their L1 linguistic system. Some learners were detected expressing a remarkable assimilation, a shift in their self-determination and ethnic identity, feeling more comfortable adopting the TL norms and conventions, forsaking their L1 culture and norms (Gardner, 2007). These learners were noticed to harbour a positive attitude towards the TL or its community; in fact, they carried no ambivalent desire to learn it and practise it regularly, they preferred this TL to their own L1 as in (see Appendix M: Table 14: Diary number 2, Extract 5). On scanning FMAX’s diary entry, it could be claimed that she is constructing a new identity in the TL, a foreign language-mediated identity. In spite of the fact that FMAX is neither immersed in the TL community, nor in regular direct contact with them, she seems to pursue a bicultural identity besides her aspiration for being bilingual. She entertains a positive attitude towards the TL and to its community, ‘enjoy speaking English’. It appears that she was not able to add a new perspective to her older one; in fact, she has got her older identity destabilised for the sake of her newly adopted practices, behaviours and identity. The durability of her old identities is questioned. All these transformations seem to be voluntarily done rather than enforced on her. She is willing to assimilate and participate actively within the TL boundaries. Similarly, AMAX developed a supportive attitude towards that TL and its community to the extent that she feels more ‘comfortable’ using it for her own L1. She holds a belief that the TL is gentler than her own mother tongue in certain respects. It could be claimed that she is constructing a new identity in the TL in which she is willing to adopt native-like patterns
of behaviour. To illustrate, she explicitly referred to the attributes that one ought to possess 'English is more better than Arabic in some words'. FMAX and AMAX along with others value the TL; they were reinventing themselves as a multilingual people whom they can admire. It appears that they aspire for not only integration, but rather for all-embracing assimilation, i.e. becoming members of the TL cultural and social community where they prefer the TL feeling more comfortable in it. In keeping with FMAX and AMAX, EHAX values the TL means of expression where she thinks the TL is a better means of expression.

Taking a new turn, NMAX pronounced the emergence of her foreign language-mediated identity. New beliefs about her self-concept in relation to her new emerging identity are crystallising, 'it helped me to figure out my true identity'. It appears that her old identity is destabilised and that she needs to establish a new emotional balance while reinventing her new identity. She seems to be open and accepting to what the new social norms and the cultural values that the TL impose on her. It could be claimed that transformation is occurring rather than coexistence of identities (L1 & TL identities). To her, it is becoming ‘a way of living’, a new self is emerging. It could be argued that this learner has yielded to the international posture and the social power of the TL. It seems that her beliefs about the TL as well as her L1 play a vital role in constructing her new identity. It could be claimed that her firm belief that the TL ‘the leading language in the world and the most effective one’ overrides the grips over her L1. This outcome could be seen in contrast to findings of Siegal’s (1996) study where the subjectivity of the white western upper-middle-class women was co-constructed meanwhile their
acquiring the Japanese L2. Her learners purposefully chose to diverge with the TL social conventions where they were reckoned at odds with their L1. Learners who gained the necessary proficiency were noted to resist socially unacceptable self-image which indicates the importance of subjectivity in pragmatic development according to Siegal (1996).

These were the only members of their cohort who demonstrated these viewpoints; however, it deserves attention in case it could invoke further motivation and accordingly bring about success in the TL. Further attention needs to given to rethinking how the learners perceive themselves in relation to the world and their identity construction vis-à-vis the TL in order to find out how it might be helpful in enhancing language learning and attainment. It could be argued that these learners’ attitudes appear as distinctive because they are foreign language learners who had very limited opportunities for exposure and interaction with TL community, an assumption that was checked in the beginning of the study before administering the intervention using the socioeconomic questionnaires. It has been established that no learners (except for EHAX) have lived in an English speaking country for more than 3 years successively and that they do not communicate using the TL except in this foreign language context. All of them reside in Egypt or had resided in an Arabic speaking country and then moved to Egypt. Therefore, it seems quite peculiar that this pattern of ‘what they would like to become’, near-native speakers of the TL hold firm grips of their ideas. These findings are comparable to those of Abdulkader and Laugharne (2016), in which their learners had this preponderate desire to travel and study overseas with no prior encouraging
experience to prompt them to embrace this aspiration. It could be argued that the majority of the Arab learners have the propensity to hold favourable views regarding English as a foreign language in spite of very limited exposure and brief experience. It is a predetermined preference that is founded on no sustainable evidence or experience.
6.4. Diary Entry Number 3

The following diary entries have been elicited by a set of questions directly related to the learners’ desire to attain the pragmatic component of the TL. It also has attempted to sketch their attitudes towards language learning experience. The first question (see Appendix C) has endeavoured to explore their willingness to learn TL pragmatics and whether it had been useful for them as learners. It has investigated their attitudes towards this development, learning the pragmatic component of the TL. The second question has attempted to examine the learners’ insights and self-evaluation about their own development in the TL. It has scanned the learners’ attitudes towards the learning situation and the need to acquire the functional component of the TL. Being concerned with the functional aspect of the language as a crucial component of communicative competence and accordingly L2 learning, sensitising language learners towards this component is deemed indispensable and exploring their attitudes towards this experience is believed to be of no less equal importance.

On reviewing the learners’ records in the third diary entry, with a total of 45 logs, there were clear indications that two key patterns were identified. Quite a large number of the learners were made cognisant of the functional aspect of the TL. They expressed their full or partial awareness of some of the key features of pragmatics such as the sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic components. Another key pattern that was noticed was that some of the learners managed their affective barriers with various degrees, with few exceptions. Being actively engaged in a process of self-evaluation about their own development in the TL, many learners examined their own self-realisation in the TL learning experience.
On scanning the diary entries, it was detected that almost 32 learners out of the total number of 45 managed to show a good level of insight into the functional aspect of the TL. These learners seem to have had their awareness raised concerning the importance of being sensitised to the socially and culturally appropriate forms of the language to warrant the realisation of successful communication. These learners showed growing awareness as opposed to the rest of the cohort group who did not demonstrate a comparable ability for a range of reasons that will be succinctly explored in the following paragraphs. They appear to have entertained a positive attitude towards the pragmatic aspect of the TL enhancing the language learning experience as in (see Appendix M: Table 15: Diary number 3, Extract 1). On examining MTAX’s diary entry, she became sensitised to the linguistic resources needed for communicative acts, the strategies and the routines required to avoid pragmatic failure. For instance, she mentioned employing an attention getter in the beginning of the conversation, metalinguistic awareness. It appears that she became aware of the consequence of her pragmatic choices where her appropriate social behaviour in the TL crystallises. She became aware of directness and politeness techniques in relation to the social parameters of the situation. MTAX seems to hold a supportive attitude towards her new learning; she becomes equipped with learning that improves her experience. Similarly, NTAX holds an encouraging attitude towards NSs of the TL, and thus she aspires to communicate with them using socially acceptable and culturally appropriate language. She became more apt at employing directness techniques, better preparation, and finer hinting. Her ability to utilise appropriate strategies, routines, and social behaviours to communicate enhanced her self-concept in the TL, which is likely to boost her levels of
confidence and thus facilitate her language learning experience. In the same vein, 
FHAX expressed her contentment with the development she achieved regarding 
learning the TL strategies, routines as well as the social behaviours. She became aware 
of the consequences of her own linguistic choices as far as her communication is 
concerned which makes of her an effective speaker as well as confident one as in: ’I am 
able to express myself easier’. Being familiarised with a wide range of linguistic 
resources, MWAX was happy with her improved communicative abilities, the strategies 
and the routines that she had attained are likely to enable her to engage in successful 
communicative acts.

YGAX is a learner who has previously shown her belief about the perfect alignment of the 
two cultures, L1 and the TL. It seems that she misconstrued the seeming similarity of some 
of the communication patterns of both culture (Al-Issa, 2003; Wierzbicka, 2003; Yu, 1999). 
After six weeks of the intervention, and with her raised awareness towards the functional 
aspect of the TL, YGAX seems to have developed a clearer picture concerning the 
mismatch between her L1 and the TL (misconstrued preconceived notions). Being equipped 
with the right strategies, routines, and social behaviour, she became familiarised with the 
appropriate manner to communicate with the TL speakers. YGAX’s third diary extract relays 
that she has experienced some development in her learning that can be cross referenced 
with her performance on the MDCT and the WDCT. It appears that her post-intervention 
WDCT matches her diary entries, where she attempts to decipher the social norms of the 
TL. She attempts to identify the hidden social norms of the TL by building on her current 
knowledge, her L1 (Ishihara & Cohen, A., 2014; Ringbom, 1987). Her performance in the
production WDCT signals that she has shown some improvement, nevertheless her pragmatic skills need further honing in order to be able to employ the acceptable linguistic resources according the sociopragmatic norms and the contextual cues. Her evolving belief that the cultural social norms of both cultures are not the same is another step in a long process of learning that is ahead of her. She needs to enhance her learning to bridge the gap between her L1-L2 and to boost her IL to motivate her to communicate competently and effectively. Her third diary extract reflects on her reworked assumptions in the TL.

However, this was not necessarily the case. With compelling evidence, some learners were seen to display *lack of ability to shift focus away from the grammatical aspect of the TL*. Focusing on the grammatical and structural aspects of the TL rather than the functional one, they believed in the primacy of the grammatical aspect of the language over other aspects. This could be set in contrast to the previous discussion regarding the learners’ burgeoning awareness towards the importance of the functional aspect of the TL as well as the miscellany of cultures of the different languages (see Appendix M: Table 15: Diary number 3, Extract 2).

With closer inspection of SBAX’s diary entry, it could be clearly argued that there were some learners among them SBAX, who could not shift their focus away from the grammatical aspect of the TL, though they tended to be of a very small number. They seemed to be set on the preconceived notion that the grammar and the structural aspect of the language is the predominant component of it. She was disposed to employ her knowledge of pragmatics to serve her accuracy and correctness in
pronunciation and grammar. Even though she was able to develop a positive attitude towards the language learning experience, she failed to perceive the importance of the functional aspect of the TL, which was meant to enable learners to notice and to employ it in possible interaction with NSs. Similarly, ESAX failed to recognise the functional aspect of the TL as an essential component; she thought of vocabulary and grammar as the most crucial components rather than the functional one. She seems to attain the sequential structure of the conversation, a significant pragmatic feature; however, she still holds a preconceived belief of the primacy of the structural and grammatical component of the TL learning. There seems to be encouraging evidence of the emergence of one feature of pragmatics as in the conversation structure and features, yet, her learning is still underway in some respects. In spite of the experience, her pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic knowledge seems to be lagging behind, she has not assigned close attention to the proper linguistic resources as well as the proper social conventions and norms of the TL. Her undivided attention on the grammatical aspect of the language seems to distract her from grasping the importance of the functional one. It is recommended that these preconceived notions about the TL and the TL learning should be rectified and any adverse ramifications should be catered for to allow for more efficient language learning. One explanation to this occurrence might be that these learners have their own predetermined language learning agenda and that they purposefully decided not to depart from it regardless to any other proposed ones, the facilitator's agenda.
Regarding the learners who were sensitised towards the functional aspect of the TL, it could be claimed that these learners were noticed to have their self-confidence boosted, their levels of anxiety managed if not curbed, and their **affective barriers well-controlled**. They were detected to be motivated, developing a constructive attitude towards the TL and their language learning experience. These learners communicated this encouraging development as in (see Appendix M: Table 17: Diary number 3, Extract 3).

On examining these learners’ diary entries, it could be argued that these learners among others were able to **manage some of the affective barriers** that debilitated their language learning development. They seem to have controlled the high levels of anxiety they endured, bringing it to the limit of being facilitative. Their self-confidence was instilled and their fear of errors and reticence have been curbed. To start with, SFAX explicitly communicated her transformation from a state of hesitance and anxiety to a more stable state with full determination to attain TL. Foreign language anxiety is believed to have the potential effect of debilitating language learning and acquisition both as input processing and production of output (Horwitz, 1986, 2016; Ishihara & Cohen, A., 2014; Zheng, 2008). Thus, overcoming language anxiety has a facilitative effect on language learning. It also invites a supportive attitude towards the TL and the TL language learning experience with the evolving positive self-concept, such as: ‘I am ready to use English outside the classroom, I wont be as shy or unsure of myself’. SFAX further underscores that with low levels of anxiety and higher self-confidence, she is able to extend her learning in other unfamiliar situations outside of the contrived
context of the classroom. She develops abilities to communicate using the TL in real life situations, the main objective behind foreign language learning that every learner strives for and every teacher pursues.

In the same vein, MAAX expresses his contentment with the TL as reflected in his enhanced self-confidence and his manageable levels of anxiety. It seems that he has experienced transformation similar to that of SFAX. He developed an ability to start up a conversation confidently and smoothly, a prior problem that he was able to identify. It seems that he was able to overcome his fears of public-performance and communication being equipped with new skills and knowledge, the pragmatic aspect of the TL. The novelty of the knowledge has positively influenced his affect and it motivated him to explore new realms in the language learning experience. With an explicit expression of self-confidence, SEAX initiated her diary record stating that she became a more effective speaker. Perceiving herself as a polite and formal speaker who is able to identify what to say in each situation, equipped with higher command of pragmatic knowledge. SEAX felt more secure about her performance in the TL, and thus she can use it in communication and in interaction more commendably. Overcoming the affective barriers of foreign language anxiety and fear, besides boosting one’s self-confidence as well as his self-concept in the TL are likely to have a facilitative effect on language learning and communication (Horwitz, 1986, 2016; Ishihara & Cohen, A., 2014; Zheng, 2008).
HRAX was noticed to **struggle with her affective barriers**. At that point in her learning experience and development, she seems to sense better improvement as far as her affect. She appears to approach her language learning with a more accepting attitude. According to her own pre-set agenda, she seems to have achieved one-stepping stone, being able to build up a conversation. She is no longer apprehensive about her public-performance or her being engaged in communicative activities before her fellow-learners, a simulation of real life experience. It could be argued that her promising positive attitude towards learning and the experience as a whole is likely to bring about more gains in relation to her language learning on the long-run. Expectancy of success, even on a small scale, motivates the learner to expend more effort and encourages him or her to achieve ultimate success. However, towards the end of her record, HRAX voiced her acute sense of isolation. Her distress and discomfort as a result of her sense of alienation from the TL and the TL community may deter her from actively participating in communicative activities and in turn, it may have a debilitating effect on her language learning. A negative consequence could be easily discerned as an inevitable result to this deleterious affect. An expectation was realised when HRAX’s performance on the MDCT and the WDCT was compared to her diary entries. They could be easily matched together; her sense of alienation was echoed in her declining performance (see Chapters 4 & 5). It could be noticed that she grapples with her language learning in spite of the efforts she expends on achieving the TL. Her performance is not aligned with her efforts simply because of these psychological barriers are impenetrable. She is entangled in a burgeoning sense of alienation and discomfort impeding her development and baffling TL input. She observes that ‘I still feel that I'm a stranger to
this language’. HRAX’s case attracts attention towards similar cases in which affective barriers debilitates language learning. To secure enhanced learning outcomes, further efforts need to be exhausted on the part of teachers, practitioners, and stakeholders to detect such cases and work on alleviating their possible negative impact, by raising the learners’ awareness and counteracting their adverse influence.

Nevertheless, counter-evidence to the strong evidence that was discussed earlier concerning the learners who succeeded in managing their emotional hurdles, others were noted to be unable to manage their affective barriers. They were unable to manage their anxiety levels and they lacked self-confidence. This feature was detected in the diary entries of some learners as for instance (see Appendix M: Table 18: Diary number 3, Extract 4). On scanning FSHAX’s diary entry, it could be easily determined that she among other learners suffered from unmanageable levels of foreign language anxiety, as a result of self-consciousness and fear of being publically exposed before strangers or her fellow-learners. Self-consciousness is an anxiety-evoking instance in which the learner becomes hyper-sensitive to mistakes to the extent that she avoids using the TL altogether. Concerns about how these mistakes may be perceived by peers and her looking or sounding ridiculous before others including her teacher may provoke tremendous anxiety. Her record suggests that she endures this painful anxiety as reflected in her own words stating that she felt ‘uncomfortable’, ‘nervous’, ‘stuttering’, she even went to the extent of experiencing vocabulary attrition and memory loss related issues. Teachers should be sensitised towards these affective barriers as they might have negative impact on language learning. They should handle language
learners’ self-esteem with considerable sensitivity. The learners’ desire to attain approval warns against possible mental or physical withdrawal from the language learning experience if this goal is not partially or fully achieved, teachers have to detect such patterns early enough to avoid losing their learners.

Taking a new turn in restructuring their individual system of language, their IL, some learners were observed to employ **comparison between L1-L2** and to bring their prior language learning experiences to their new language learning environment to facilitate their language learning. These learners, among which is SHAX and EHAX, consistently **leaned back on their L1 system** to bridge the gap between their L1-L2, shunning instances of deviation from the TL norms (see Appendix M: Table 19: Diary number 3, Extract 5). SHAX’s diary entry revealed that she considered the difference in the pragmatic norms between her L1 and the TL. She unequivocally marked the pragmalinguistic difference between the two cultures as well as the level of directness employed in both cultures such as ‘give me the money’ versus ‘I forgot my money, could you lend me money, please?’ . It could be argued that SHAX brought her prior language learning experiences, her L1 pragmatic knowledge to use it as a foundation for her new language, the TL pragmatic knowledge, to facilitate their language learning. She utilised this explicit expression of the divergence in the two cultures’ pragmatic norms to mark her new learning, as a language learning self-regulatory technique (Cohen, A. & Macaro, 2007, 2011; Chamot, 2004). She directs this ‘talk’ to herself to pronounce this difference out loud as a self-learning technique, an inner speech, a self-regulatory technique to marshal her learning (Goldstein, 2007). Similarly, EHAX seems to have
distinguished the inconsistency between her L1 pragmatic norms and the TL pragmatic norms. She even takes her new learning a step further, in which she employs it her daily life communicative activities, given that she is immersed in the TL culture, living in Egypt (EHAX is a special case an English NS learning Arabic, ASL learner). She clearly pronounces the communicative gains of learning some of the pragmatic features of the TL, as ‘It’s not meant to be rude’, where pragmatic failure might have been a possible outcome. Therefore, some learners were able to employ L1-L2 comparison as a facilitative tool for achievement and communication in their language learning experience (Eslami & Noora, 2008; Odlin, 1989; Ellis, 1997). It is widely believed that noticing the gap between L1-L2 pragmatic norms and feature has a major role in facilitating language learning. It appears that learners became cognisant of the cultural difference between their L1 and the TL. Along the same lines, PTAX expressed her transformed knowledge concerning how to employ politeness techniques with range of addressees with various levels of familiarity and casualness of relationships. She stressed the fact that addressing a friend in her L1 differs from that of the TL, a gap that she noticed and added to her TL pragmatic knowledge. It seems that learners started to identify the new pragmatic features that they added them to their ILP.

The second key pattern that was identified in the learners’ self-reported diary entries is that they were able to **self-evaluate their own development in the TL**. They were found to become increasingly aware of their study goals, how to accomplish these goals, and how much to learn. They were inclined to make decisions about their language learning and to measure their own progress towards previously set goals in
their learning agenda. They bestowed self-awareness and willingness to be active learners, a feature that is likely to positively impact learner achievement and success (Kecskes, 2013).

NSAX’s diary extract (see Appendix M: Table 20: Diary number 3, Extract 6) reveals that she embraces an encouraging self-concept of her linguistic ability. She is able to evaluate her own progress ‘improved’ as well the language learning process identifying one of its key elements ‘by practicing using videos and pop conversations’. Developing key components of autonomy such as reevaluating oneself including self-concept including one’s awareness of one’s own roles and responsibilities, establishing one’s own goals and self-regulating oneself are considered vital in language learning success (O’Leary, C. 2014; Grabe & Benson, 2001). Attempting to direct and manage efforts towards enhancing one’s own learning makes for better learning and success. She seems to be taking actions to make her learning easier, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and thus more transferrable to other meaningful contexts. She seems to be disposed to assess her own needs as language learner to practise more with an impoverished context, EFL context, including her evaluation of her own strengths and weaknesses. Richards and Lockhart (2002: 56) contend ‘Learners’ perceptions of their own strengths and weaknesses as language learners can influence the use they make of opportunities available for language learning and the priorities they set themselves.’ Likewise, SFAX was able to identify the importance of feedback as a key feature in the language learning process. She underscored the importance of constructive feedback in modifying output, and enhancing positive language learning in
which the learners are pushed to process the target pragmatic features at a deeper cognitive level (Takahashi, 2010a; Takimoto, 2007). She stressed the importance of managing her affective barriers as for instance, her language-ego by avoiding embarrassment or risking her public image by learning from her peers. Another key element that she underlines in her record is the importance of authenticity and authentic language learning context. She is equipped with the appropriate language learning to enable her to participate in communicative activities in the future. SFAX was able to set her own communicative goals, to communicate in real-life situations and she was able to assess her own learning needs as well, to avoid embarrassment. She is becoming an autonomous learner, a feature that is likely to enhance success in her language learning experience. It appears that this language learning experience has given these learners a chance to reflect on their own learning and to identify their learning goals, needs, roles, responsibilities, and progress: key elements of autonomy. Her conscious, goal-oriented attempts to manage and control her learning are critical to her language learning experience (Afflerbach et al., 2008).

On a different note, MEAX was noticed to distinguish the pragmatic knowledge of the TL with some of the key characteristics as in: politeness techniques, routines, and strategies. She deemed this functional aspect of the language as a new prospect in learning as well as living: a new identity. She entertains an encouraging self-concept of her linguistic ability tagging her future practice in the language as ‘successful’. She is able to evaluate her own language learning process to be progressing. MEAX developed key components of autonomy such as re-evaluating oneself including self-
concept including her own roles and responsibilities, establishing her own goals and self-regulating herself. Similarly, MTAX and NOAX identified their new knowledge of the TL functional aspect as a step forward in their predetermined language learning scheme. Their disposition to mark their language learning progress using ‘before’ and ‘now’ reflects their ability as autonomous learners to outline their own development and to measure their success in achieving some gains along a specific period of time. NOAX particularly determines how her knowledge of the TL pragmatics has fostered her ability to communicate equipped with the required means of expression which she deems necessary for effective communication. Being autonomous learners, these learners are likely to identify the functional aspect of the TL as an essential target that they need to achieve in the course of their language learning and development.
6.5. Diary Entry Number 4

As previously, a set of questions were used to solicit these diary entries related and applicable to the learners’ attitude towards their language learning experience as well as their ability to take risks in the TL. The questions (see Appendix C) endeavour to examine the learners’ attitude towards the TL learning experience on providing them with cultural awareness. The second question handles the learning material and whether they deemed it helpful in building their self-confidence on using the TL with NSs. It focuses on the learners’ emotional status: their sense of anxiety and confidence in the TL. Many researchers including Kasper and Schmidt (1996) claim the learners’ disposition to adopt L2 pragmatic norms is likely to be sensitive to their attitudes towards the TL and its community. Also, it has been contended that these learners are likely to accept the reconstruction of their self and allow for the emergence of their new identity in the light of the TL norms and practices (Masgoret & Gardner, 2003; Kasper & Schmidt, 1996).

On reviewing the learners’ records in the fourth diary entry, with a total of 45 logs, there were clear indications that one key pattern was identified. To start with, almost all learners were noted to develop a positive attitude towards the language learning experience with varying degrees of favourability. They were disposed to develop an encouraging attitude with variable levels towards the whole experience including the cognitive, the evaluative, and the behavioural components. Their supportive attitude was reflected via their opinions, their feelings, and finally their disposition to adopt particular learning behaviours, respectively. Any of these attitude components can work as a predictor of the other, a
supportive cognitive attitude towards the TL is an important predictor of behavioural intentions to use it (Van Els et al., 1984).

Regarding **the cognitive component of the learners’ attitudes**, it is thought that the learners’ beliefs and opinion shape the learners’ attitudes towards the TL and the TL learning experience (Brown, 2007; Masgoret & Gardner, 2003; Locastro, 2001). This could be easily noticed in statements expressing the learners’ perception of the usefulness of the TL and the TL learning experience (see Appendix M: Table 21: Diary number 4, Extract 1).

The learners’ personal attitudes are considered important predictor of learners’ success in achieving attainment in foreign language learning (Yang, 2012). On reviewing their diary entries, many learners showed a **high esteem of the TL** and the TL learning experience. They thought of it as a highly practical means of communication and interaction with their growing awareness of its usefulness in their professional lives and thus their attitudes towards it are shaped. Unequivocally favourable expression and recognition of ‘the course’ as ‘helpful’, as quoted by FMAX. She expressed her perception of having improved her ability to deal with diverse cultures thanks to her pragmatic knowledge of the TL culture. Similarly, EHAX seems to perceive the accrued advantages of learning the functional aspect of the TL language, pragmatics. She argues the importance of this knowledge in sensitising her, as well as all L2 learners, with insights of how to communicate with someone from another culture by understanding their social norms and cultural values. She attempts to connect her new
knowledge in the TL with the old one in L1, comparisons are made between her L1-L2. Likewise, ZHAX appears to develop a supportive attitude towards the TL learning experience. In her view, she deems it advantageous ‘it helped me a lot’. It provided her with the knowledge that would enable her to communicate and interact with NSs spontaneously with zero risk of being shunned, sounding rude or disrespectful. With bolstered self-confidence and better self-efficacy, ZHAX was able to handle new situations in the TL while exploiting her developed awareness of the cultural perspective of the TL, exploring new realms and ventures. She was able to extend herself and apply her newly attained knowledge to new experiences and contexts, achieving one of the main objective of L2 learning. SFAX seems to have followed the same line of thinking as her fellow-learners in which she expressed her keenness on the TL learning experience. According to her, ‘I think that that was very beneficial’. She emphasises the importance of checking and testing her newly learned knowledge as one of the steps that comprises her cognitive attitude development. Furthermore, she stressed the importance of getting ‘a solid background information on what the natives expect from a day to day conversation’ which boosts her levels of confidence and makes of her a better communicator and participant in the TL community.

It could be argued that these learners, along with many others, realised that they hold certain frameworks of cultural assumptions, beliefs, and values that they had previously acquired from their L1 culture (ethnocentrism) with which they interpreted the others’ behaviour. They were disposed to be so familiar with their own culture that they did not realise that it influenced their assumptions and expectations when dealing with people.
coming from different cultures. It seems that when the learners were confronted with new situations in the TL, they were inclined to use their own set of frameworks and expectations (ethnocentrism) to interpret and deal with them, which resulted in pragmatic failure or communication breakdown. Accordingly, these learners sensed the need and the usefulness of the TL and the TL learning experience in equipping them with the required knowledge to communicate effectively in the TL, a previously acknowledged need.

It is believed that the learners’ attitudes can govern the future of their linguistic system (Gardner, 2007; Noels et al., 2003). Regarding the affective component of the learners’ attitude, the learners’ feelings and emotions that are prompted towards the situations are what outline the learners’ affect towards the TL and the TL learning experience. This could be easily noticed in statements of likes and dislikes concerning the TL and the TL learning experience (see Appendix M: Table 22: Diary number 4, Extract 2). On scanning the learners’ diary extracts, it could be easily argued that these learners, among others, were able to overcome or at least alleviate their affective barriers to varying degrees. Some of them also entertained a sense of interest and enjoyment on getting in contact with the TL and the TL community. They managed to develop supportive affective disposition towards the TL and the TL learning experience which would have been likely to become determinant on the amount of effort expended in learning the TL. Harbouring encouraging affective attitude can have a facilitative impact on the success in TL attainment (Yang, 2012; Brown, 2007; Noels et al., 2003). For instance, RNAX was noticed to communicate her bolstered self-confidence as well
as the robust reasons she offered for entertaining this positive feeling. She explained how she reduced levels of language-anxiety, which came as a result of the ample opportunities that she was given for practice as well as the instrumental knowledge that she managed to attain, ‘how to speak, how to interest and attract people’. Her lowered levels of self-consciousness and her ability to make effective use of feedback helped her cope with her apprehensions and anxiety (Horwitz et al., 1986). A similar case was revealed by AMAX and MERAX. However, AMAX stressed the novelty of the acquired knowledge and its effect on promoting her self-perception and self-esteem in the TL. MERAX, also, emphasised the importance of the authenticity of materials in encouraging learners to extend themselves and use the TL in real-life situations, that it could ‘make me happy and give me the desire to talk with people in English’. The materials were perceived as representation of the NSs’ authentic language use, one of the tenets of the communicative approach. YLAX presented another example in which learners managed to overcome their affective barriers and to maximise their gains from the TL learning experience. She voiced her improved self-confidence, enjoyment, motivation and sense of challenge as in, ‘I really enjoyed each second of this module. It was challenging and interesting’. Allowing her ample chance to practise in a contrived context that has no risks (the classroom) alleviated her language-anxiety and boosted her self-confidence. It also allowed her to take the challenge and the low-stake risk of trying herself out in the TL in this stress-free context (Koba et al., 2000).

It could be claimed that affective barriers and stereotypes about the TL that learners may have developed may provoke them to reject the TL culture including its frameworks and the
expectations and may even invoke a sense of hostility towards the TL itself, sabotaging attainment and success. Therefore, teachers and stakeholders are advised to detect such instances and deal with them as promptly as possible to sustain a more conducive learning context. It should be highlighted that it is the facilitator/teacher’s role to make her learners more forbearing and aware of the others’ culture building understanding and encouraging tolerance. It is to enable them to relativize their own cultural values, beliefs, and behaviours and investigate for themselves the others’ culture including their cultural and social norms.

Regarding **the behavioural component of the learners’ attitude**, certain attitudes provide the learners with the disposition to adopt particular learning behaviours and intentions towards the TL and the TL learning situation (Bernat, 2008; Gardner, 2007; Masgort & Gardner, 2003; Wenden, 1985). This could be easily noticed in statements expressing what the learners do or intend to do (see Appendix M: Table 23: Diary number 4, Extract 3). On scanning the diary extracts of the learners, it could be noticed that they embraced a positive attitude towards the TL and the TL learning experience. In particular, they focused on behavioural aspect of their attitude, which deals with the way they behaved and reacted in particular situations. In fact, some of them were inclined to adopt various aspects of behaviours, which characterise the members of the TL community. They tended to be eager to acquire more and they were disposed to engage themselves in communicative activities using the TL. To illustrate, DAAX attempted to apply what she had been taught throughout the intervention in a new situation in real-life experience. She was inclined to adopt behaviours similar to these of the TL community and members; in fact, she wanted to put what she had learned into practice. It seems that the research context empowered her with opportunities to use
the learned pragmatic forms in their real-life situations, which she attempted to practise outside of the contrived context of the classroom. This was an outcome that contributed new knowledge to the research of pragmatics in that it illustrated that learners use their pragmatic knowledge outside of the classroom, in the real-life situation after instruction. Although it is one speech act, there is evidence that instruction can foster learning, which might be useful in real-life situations later on.

Similarly, MWAX expressed her encouraging attitude towards the TL experience, which encouraged her to overcome her apprehensions, and her over self-consciousness, and diffidence. Her positive attitude encouraged her to challenge herself by doing a presentation. Likewise, MAAX harboured a positive attitude towards the TL and the TL learning experience, which prompted her to handle conversations using the TL. Embracing this optimistic attitude encouraged her to learn more.

This supportive attitude towards the TL learning experience was the prevalent attitude in the majority of the learners’ fourth diary entries. However, a marginal group deviated from this main trend; they relayed their concerns about their learning experience (see Appendix M: Table 24: Diary number 4, Extract 4). On reviewing these learners’ diary extracts, it could be easily noticed that these learners, among many other young EFL learners, are obsessed with pronunciation and especially with accent which may prove to be counterproductive for other aspects of the language learning process as well as for communication intelligibility. Paul (2012) contends that setting unrealistic targets such as native-like pronunciation is likely to result in disappointment and
frustration. It could be argued that, for decades, traditional language instruction, heavily rooted in Audio-Lingual Method and/or Grammar-Translation Method, advocated native-like pronunciation as the ideal pronunciation and the mastery of the grammar system, unrealistic goals to be achieved (Adamson, 2003: 606-608, as cited in Davies & Elder, 2003). That is why it would be recommended that foreign language instruction should be aiming at intelligibility rather than native-like pronunciation. All three-sample learners reiterated this unrealistic goal and they seemed to perceive no other or subsidiary goals. For instance, FSHAX relayed her over-concern about pronunciation accuracy stating ‘embarrassed’, ‘humiliated’, ‘nervous’, forget all the lines’, and ‘not even want to try’. Her description reflects the traumatic experience that she among others might undergo having held up this idealistic goal. Another example, TAAX also expressed her over-concern about phonetics, i.e. pronunciation, besides grammar. Her self-consciousness about rules and accuracy in favour of communication is likely to intimidate her from even attempting the TL altogether as FSHAX mentioned. A third instance reiterating this very concern about accuracy and rule-formation is ESAX. She further adds rote memorisation of vocabulary. These learners are likely to reduce their task in language learning to memorising inventories of vocabulary, with a possible outcome of memory loss or mental block under the circumstances of nervousness and stress. These learners should be familiarised with the multifaceted spectrum that makes up a language and the array of goals towards which they can achieve varying levels of success. It is a chance to revaluate their own goals, with new prospects for success and self-fulfilment rather than focusing on unrealistic and unachievable goals.
6.6. Summary of the General Features Noted in the Four Diaries Collectively:

In summary, it could be shown that the learners were noted to develop a positive attitude towards the TL and the TL learning experience with varying degrees. First, the majority of the learners were disposed to develop this encouraging attitude towards the TL itself, the material, the facilitator, and themselves as language learners with insights into the reasons for their own progress or deterioration towards ultimate success. Second, it was shown that they expressed their active involvement in the language learning experience and their motivation, to which each learner examined their own reasons for their individual desire to acquire the TL. They had the desire and they were ready to expend the required effort at various levels. However, some learners appeared to grapple with their learning due to certain affective barriers that seemed to impede their progress, whereas others suffered limited control over their linguistic abilities. Nevertheless, some of these learners managed their affective barriers with varying degrees of success. Thirdly, a large number of the learners appeared to be sensitised to the functional aspect of the TL and attempted to compare it to their own L1 system. They expressed their full or partial awareness with some of the key features of pragmatics such as the sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic components. Their awareness was raised concerning the importance of being sensitised to the socially and culturally appropriate forms of the language to warrant the realisation of successful communication. This functional aspect of the TL is highly related to the appropriateness of behaviour conditioned by the TL cultural conventions. Having noticed some of the target pragmatic features according to their individual interpretation facilitates the internalisation of them from the available input (Schmidt, 1993, 1995, 2001). Fourth, they were noted to develop a positive attitude towards the language learning experience.
with varying degrees including the cognitive, the evaluative, and the behavioural components of this attitude. It could be stated that these diary entries were able to capture particular moments of scientific observations in the time of the learners’ language learning experience. Learners were able to recall certain moments and events; they provided their own perceptions and interpretations of these events and how they managed to communicate. Respondents’ biases including underreporting or over-reporting were handled carefully by putting their contributions back in their context and seeing them in the light of that context.

6.7. Summary of the Main Uncommon Findings of the Learners’ Performance on the Three Different Instruments Pre-During-and Post- Intervention and Discussion:
On reviewing the results yielded from the three instruments, it could be noticed that results of the MDCT do not strictly align with those of the WDCT, although the WDCT outcomes are in line with the diary elicited patterns. Mixed findings were shown when the results of both instruments (M/WDCT) were compared. FYAX, YLAX, YGAX among others embody this mismatch. It could be contended that in most of the cases the MDCT results fell short of capturing the learners’ pragmatic competence; it underrated their pragmatic recognition in some cases. This could be attributed to low cognitive demands of the task, being a multiple choice task. Another plausible reason might be that the learners underestimated it, thus they did not expend much effort in completing it. They might have used their heuristic skills rather than retrieving their pragmatic competence in handling this task. On another note, the primacy of perception over production is a contention held by some scholars, in which they argued that perception
precedes production. In keeping with the claims of Clark (1993: 246), “Logically, comprehension must precede production”. Along the lines of Clark (1993), Pomacóndor (1999) and Neufeld (1988) (cited in Zangoei et al., 2014: 2) claim that perception precedes production and that accurate perception is at least one necessary component of accurate production (see Chapter 2). That is to say that if learners produce the TL with high level competency and effectiveness, it is surmised that their recognition or perception should not be any less; however, findings evinced that this reasoning might be misleading. The present study obtained outcomes that seem to challenge this consensus where perception and production outcomes did not seem to be corresponding (in line with Taguchi, 2008 and Bardovi-Harlig & Do’nyei, 1998). In some cases, the learners’ production superseded their recognition/perception by far. YGAX is a case in point. She fell back sharply in her recognition and when her production was closely examined, it showed very encouraging results revealing that her pragmatic competence (production) is emerging. She produced appropriate structures in her WDCT post-intervention with well-above moderate improvement exemplified in her including request embedded in conditional structures, conventionally indirect strategies, and some post-head act strategies (see Chapter 5). Therefore, it can be stated that perception and production conflate to assess the learners’ pragmatic knowledge with no suggested directional relationship between them (Chang, 2011). In addition, results garnered from recognition questionnaires need to be well matched and triangulated with other evaluation tools.
On comparing the findings of the WDCT and those of the diary entries, they seem perfectly matching in which there is correspondence between the learners’ production and their self-expression. To illustrate just a few examples, the case of HRAX in which her diary extract introspectively probed into the reasons behind her falling back on both the MDCT and the WDCT. HRAX expressed her struggle with her affective barriers. Although she had supportive affect towards the TL and the TL learning experience, with an accepting attitude and high motivation, she suffered unmanageable levels of stress. She seemed to be disinclined to participate in public-performance or to be engaged in communicative activities. She has also communicated her acute sense of isolation, discomfort perceiving herself as a stranger to the TL which seemed impenetrable to her TL development (see Diary number 4). This may have deterred her from actively participating in communicative activities and in turn, it may have a debilitating effect on her language learning experience. That is why she grapples with her language learning in spite of the efforts she expends on achieving her learning targets, preventing her from noticing the TL features in the TL input. The case of HRAX and similar cases raise a flag to teachers, practitioners, and stakeholders to notice these negative preconceived misconceptions about the self, the TL and the learning experience which might have detrimental effects of language learning unless alleviated by considering ways in which such students can be effectively supported (Gardner, 2007; Koba et al., 2000; Ellis, 1984, 2008). Gardner (2007) and Ellis (1984, 2008) stress the importance of purposefully eschewing the assumption that we can define when learning starts and when it ends as if it had isolated, clear-cut boundaries. In fact, to them learning is rather
complex and elusive with many elaborate and multifaceted influences that are intricately intertwined.

On closer inspection of the learners’ production on the WDCT, it could be inferred that there is evidence of some differences between the learners’ production and that of NSs’ in the overall frequency of the internal modifiers employed, with the NSs modifying more frequently (quantitative difference rather than a qualitative one). This outcome could be compared to that of Otcu and Zeyrek (2006), Sasaki (1998), and Trosborg (1995) who came up with comparable outcomes as far as the frequency of the politeness supportive moves. Their learners managed to internally modify their requests syntactically and lexically. However, the learners in this present study did not show restricted use of syntactical modification devices, unlike those of Otcu and Zeyrek (2006) as well as Sasaki (1998). In fact, the learners of this study were able to use almost the full range of the syntactic downgraders that were employed by the NSs, yet their frequency of using them was below that of NSs. Therefore, no qualitative difference was noticed between the NNSs’ and the NSs’ nature of the employed internal modifiers devices. They seemed to employ modification by tense: past tense and aspect: ‘I was wondering if you could VP’, conditional syntactical downgrader, as well as a preference for interrogatives except for few cases. Similarly, they showed a tendency to employ lexical modifying downgraders (internal modification devices); they employed them with relatively high frequency and appropriateness of distribution matching that of NSs. However, some of them tended to over-present the politeness marker ‘please’, being a transparent mitigator. This outcome could be further compared to Scarcella’s (1979) results, in
which her learners over-employed the politeness marker ‘please’, a feature that classically emerges early in learners with Arabic L1 background. It can be also contrasted to that of Trosborg (1995), who noted that NSs were able to internally modify requests more frequently with a higher number of moves than the learner group (NNSs), a tendency that was reflected in the analysis of both syntactic and lexical downgraders (Trosborg, 1995: 178).

With reference to the learners' preference to use the politeness marker ‘please’ and its early emergence in the learners' performance, Otcu and Zeyrek's (2006) learners were able to employ a variety of internal lexical downgraders with frequency, particularly ‘please’, an outcome that corresponds with the findings of this present study. This overuse could be compared to the findings of Scarcella (1979), Shmidt (1983), Ellis (1992), Safont-Jordà (2003), and Li, Q. (2012) mostly in low-proficiency learners. Similar patterns were noted in House and Kasper (1987); Faerch and Kasper (1989) studies, in which the German and Danish learners overused the politeness marker ‘please’ in their request realisation, similar to this present study's findings. This overpresentation of ‘please’ might be ascribed to the fact that it is an illocutionary force indicator and a transparent mitigator, and thus NNSs prefer to employ it as a direct, explicit means of expression (Faerch & Kasper, 1989: 233). This tendency to overrepresent ‘please’ can be compared to the outcomes of Barron (2003) and Pinto (2005), where intermediate-advanced learners were seen to overuse such mitigator as well.
On reviewing the findings of the diaries which were yielded over 10 weeks of instruction, it could be stated that our learners have developed an encouraging attitude towards the experience as well as the materials employed including the awareness raising activities. They were also able to determine the challenges that they encountered while developing their pragmatic competence. They provided thorough insights into the reasons for their own progress or deterioration towards ultimate success. Many of them succeeded in managing their affective barriers with various degrees, few exceptions were noted. This outcome concurs with that of Tanaka and Oki (2015) who claim that their learners were able to identify the challenges that they encounter in developing well-balanced communicative competence. They further attest that their learners developed an encouraging perception of the raising awareness tasks and that they deemed them useful and effective. Similar findings were obtained by Rafieyan et al. (2013) in their research. In line with the findings of the current study, their learners embraced a positive attitude toward learning TL cultural features both form an overall perspective and from a specific (affective, cognitive, behavioural) perspective. Being actively and consistently engaged in a process of self-evaluation about their own development in the TL, many learners examined their own self-realisation in the TL learning experience. Their positive opinions, their supportive feelings, and their disposition to adopt encouraging learning behaviours may act as predictor of their success to learn and use the TL. Likewise, Hamouda (2014) found encouraging attitude towards instruction in pragmatics. His learners were positive towards the use of explicit pragmatic instruction to develop learners’ pragmatic competence. Learners in this study demonstrated an earnest desire and sincere readiness to exert the required effort to acquire appropriate TL pragmatics. Similarly, quite a large number of the learners of the current
study expressed their full or partial awareness of some of the key features of pragmatics such as the sociopragmatic and the pragmalinguistic components of the TL.

6.8. Conclusion:
The present study was designed to explore the role of pragmatic instruction in language learning in EFL contexts. The purpose was to find out the extent to which this instruction would have an impact on the learners’ perception, production, and their attitude towards the TL learning experience. The results suggest that instruction in the cultural and pragmatic aspects of the TL plays a vital role in communication when learning a foreign language, particularly in an impoverished context such as that of the EFL. It seems to foster the learners’ perception with a tendency to make sound judgments regarding the appropriateness of the language based on the cultural conventions that govern their communicative expression in the TL. It pushed the majority of the learners to recognise the appropriate mapping between forms, meaning, and contexts. The results also indicate that the majority of the learners were able to achieve substantial gains with reference to their production. The majority were disposed to produce language that matched and approximated that of NSs in some respects. The diary results reveal that the majority embraced a supportive attitude towards the TL and the TL learning experience. Thus, this present study adds to the body of research that lends support to formal instruction using raising awareness techniques and metapragmatic explanation to foreign language learners towards the functional or the pragmatic aspect of the TL. Based on the collective findings of this present study and the assumed substantial gains in the TL learning experience, it is necessary to raise foreign language learners’ awareness of the pragmatic aspect of the TL.
Being limited to adult Egyptian learners of English might be considered a major shortcoming to this research which might have influenced its results (with very few exceptions apart from one Syrian and one American). The presence of these two learners might have had a slight impact on the results; however, the presence of a NS was an asset with her dairies’ contribution giving thorough insights of an L2 learner of Arabic. Likewise, the Syrian learner shared most the demographic features with the sample except for the country of origin. His mother tongue is Arabic, he has had comparable exposure to TL, is of the same age range, educational background, and socio-economic features. That is why keeping him is not gauged to have tempered the results by any means. Having mentioned these cases, the results and findings of the current study are meant to provide insights. They are not meant to be generalizable to adult Egyptian learners of English. It is thought that these 2 cases out 45 should create negligible influence if any on the results. Another feature that might have caused a difficulty is unequal distribution of gender in this group in which the number of females exceeded that of males by far. Further research should explore whether gender plays any role in acquiring foreign language pragmatic competence and socio-psychological factors should be investigated in future research (Khorshidi, 2013). Taking and applying the results of this research should involve particular care and caution to the context of application.
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSION

7.0. Introduction:
This study along with others contribute to the small, yet burgeoning body of research on the role of instruction in pragmatics in the EFL contexts. Little research has been directed to explore EFL contexts. Empowering EFL learners to become efficient pragmatic users would definitely furnish them with invaluable opportunities for study, business, cultural exchanges with foreign language communities in all walks of life. Effective communication can play a small yet important role towards to the prevalence of world peace which in turn would improve the quality of the life of mankind. To perform different speech acts appropriately in different societal interactions with diverse social values, EFL learners need to be cognisant of the major patterns of behaviour in the TL and of the available choices for speech act realisation to make informed decisions in interactions. This signals a requirement for raising EFL learners' awareness of the social and the cultural norms of the TL. This study was designed to address the role of pedagogical intervention using mixed conditions (explicit & implicit) on the development of pragmatic competence and voice by Egyptian EFL learners. Requests were chosen as the target speech act under investigation due to their significant importance in the social life and that they differ in their realisation cross-linguistically (Ellis, 2005, 2008; Trosborg, 1995).

This chapter summarises the overall findings of this study vis-à-vis the three research questions and the Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1993,1995, 2001). Implications of the role of pragmatic instruction on the development of pragmatic competence and implications for L2 instruction are presented. Some limitations of this study are discussed as well as some suggestions for future research in diverse directions.
7.1. Summary of the Study Outcomes:
The present study was designed to explore the role of pragmatic instruction on the learners’ perception, production, and their attitude towards the TL learning experience. Findings of this study should be accrued to many other reports that confirm previous research findings on the positive effect of pragmatics instruction on the development of learners’ pragmatic competence (Reza & Alikhani, 2016; Kim, 2016; Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015; Birjandi & Derakhshan, 2014; Tan and Farashaiyan, 2012; Eslami & Eslami-Rasekh, 2008; Alcón-Soler, 2005; Martínez-Flor, 2004; Rose & Kasper, 2001, 2002; Olshtain & Cohen, A., 1990) (this is not meant to be a definitive list). The current study results indicate that instruction in pragmatic aspects plays a vital role in communication when learning in an EFL context because learners tend not acquire appropriate usage of the TL on their own. It is crucial in foreign-language classrooms, because pedagogical intervention is an important means of access to the TL. The overall results of the current study concur with those of Taguchi (2007) in supporting the fact that learning in an EFL context does not necessarily disadvantage pragmatic development, though it is considered to be an impoverished context. In fact, foreign language pragmatics is amenable to instruction and it can benefit extensively from formal instruction using raising awareness techniques and explicit metapragmatic information (Taguchi, 2015; Takahashi, 2010a, 2010b; Jeon & Kaya, 2006). It seems to foster the learners’ perception with a tendency to make sound judgments regarding the appropriateness of the language based on the cultural conventions that govern their communicative expression in the TL. The results also indicate that the majority of the learners were able to achieve substantial gains with reference to their production. A considerable number of the learners were disposed to produce language that approximated that of NSs in many respects. They were able to use frequent and well-assigned external
and internal modification devices pre and within their head-act requests. In addition, the diary results reveal that the majority of the learners embraced an encouraging attitude towards the TL and the TL learning experience. Based on the collective findings of this present study, raising foreign language learners’ awareness towards the pragmatic aspects of the TL is deemed necessary, because it can be assumed to have substantial gains in the TL learning experience. To better understand pragmatic competence development, three research questions were explored as detailed in the following paragraphs:

The first research question focused on the extent to which instruction in pragmatics, using awareness raising techniques, typographical input enhancement, and form comparison between L1-L2, metapragmatic explicit explanation will affect the learners’ ability to make judgments about the appropriateness of requests. It was measured in terms of the respondents’ ability to recognise the appropriate-inappropriate pragmatic responses in the given situations. In relation to the first research question, a paired-sample t-test was conducted to compare the learners’ ability to make judgments about the appropriateness of requests before and after the intervention. There was a significant difference between the total scores of the learners in their pre-intervention and the post-intervention MDCTs. These results suggest that instruction in pragmatics has positively affected their ability to make judgments about the appropriateness of requests at the post-intervention stage compared with the pre-intervention stage. On reflecting on the learners’ pragmatic recognition, some major findings were evinced. The learners’ pragmatic judgments at the post-intervention MDCT improved compared with that of the pre-intervention due to the good use of the awareness raising techniques and the metapragmatic explanation employed during the
intervention phase. The learners’ awareness and noticing of the target pragmatic forms was assured by highlighting the sociopragmatic parameters of the situations using the typographical input enhancement. In addition, they received rich explicit metapragmatic explanation which revealed to them the TL rules and forms deductively and comparisons between L1-L2 forms. Then, they were provided with ample chance to process these forms where their higher-order cognitive skills were active. They were provided with opportunities for meaningful practice, in which the learners tested hypotheses about their own understanding, analysed the target forms, compared them to their own production, and induced reasoning behind these differences. Findings show that a large number of learners became more sensitised to the context-based variation in language use (form-function-context mappings), recognising appropriate-inappropriate pragmatic responses in given situations. These findings reiterate that a high level of awareness is crucial for the noticing and the subsequent intake of the target pragmatic forms.

The second research question examined the extent to which instruction in pragmatics will affect the learners’ performance of target-like requests that are pragmalinguistically and sociopragmatically appropriate. On inspecting the learners’ pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic competence, the data showed mixed outcomes when it comes to the extent to which learners have achieved gains. The pragmatic intervention facilitated acquisition to a large extent providing that it involved some level of deep cognitive processing where the learners were pushed to process the TL features on their own (Taguchi, 2015; Takimoto, 2009, 2012). The majority of learners were disposed to employ a battery of strategies that matched those of the NSs in the baseline data, in two positions: pre-head act and within
head act. Learners were able to use almost all subtypes of internal and external modification devices. A less frequent trend was noted in some learners’ performance where they overproduced the politeness marker ‘please’ with very high frequency as the one and only mark of politeness. This specific finding could be compared to that of Scarcella (1979), Schmidt (1983), Ellis (1992), Safont-Jordà (2003), and Li, Q. (2012), where their EFL learners were detected to employ ‘please’ as a lexical mitigator early enough in their performance. A general tendency to rely heavily on conventionally indirect strategies was noted in the learners’ performance, when they were addressing their request to their equals or people who were in higher positions. However, when requests were addressed to people in lower positions, they were marked with an inclination to using more direct request strategies in realising their request without combining them with modification strategies to downplay the assertive voice of the request, expect for few cases. This heavy reliance on conventionally indirect strategies as an outcome can be compared to that of Achiba (2003), Rose (2000), Umar (2004), Félix-Barsdefer (2007), and Aribi (2012). Another noteworthy outcome that was revealed is that a substantial proportion of learners produced highly elaborate structures in the pre-head act and the within the head act, with complete or partial absences of expansion in the post-head act. Two exceptional cases were noticed to deteriorate in their recognition MDCT but that was not strictly paralleled in their WDCT production. A case in point is one of the students who fell back sharply in her recognition MDCT. However, when her WDCT production was closely examined in the post-intervention, it showed very encouraging results revealing that her pragmatic competence is emerging with well-above moderate improvement (see Chapter 5). No learner opted out from producing requests or leaving a blank space for a request rejoinder; in fact, all learners
contributed fully in filling out the MDCTs and the WDCTs (compare with Rose, 2000). It seems that the teacher-researcher was able to encourage learners to participate in the task at hand creating an interest for them in the intervention. She seems to have had an impact on the learners; willingness to participate in this project, including the NS (EHAX).

The third research question focused on the learners' attitudes towards the TL learning experience during and after the pragmatic instructional intervention. On comparing the findings of the MDCT, WDCT and that of the diary entries, they seem perfectly aligned in which a correlation between the learners' production and their self-expression is revealed, except for only one case of sharp deterioration (see Chapter 6). The findings of the diaries over the 10-week instruction indicate that the learners have developed an encouraging attitude towards the experience as well as the materials employed including the awareness raising techniques, the facilitator, and themselves as language learners. They were also able to determine the challenges that they encountered while developing their pragmatic competence. They provided thorough insights into the reasons for their own progress or deterioration towards ultimate success in their foreign language learning (compare to Tanaka & Oki, 2015). Many of them succeeded in managing their affective barriers with varying degrees, yet, few exceptions were noted. The majority of the learners were well motivated to mixed degrees to learn the TL. They had the desire and they were ready to expend the required effort at various levels. Most of the learners expressed their full or partial awareness of some of the key features of TL pragmatics such as the sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic components of TL. Being actively engaged in a process of self-evaluation about their own development in the TL, some learners examined their own self-
realisation in the TL learning experience. They were disposed to develop an encouraging attitude with variable levels towards the whole experience including the cognitive, the evaluative, and the behavioural components (similar patterns were noted in Liu’s 2007 study). Their positive opinions, their supportive feelings, and their disposition to adopt encouraging learning behaviours may be good predictor of their success in learning and using the TL. These findings can be compared to these of Chen (2009); Rafieyan et al. (2013); Hamouda (2014); and Kim (2016). Finally, a lesser trend that was found in the data where learners’ subjectivity emerged as a key element that has an impact on the learners’ pragmatic development. It appears that some of the learners were motivated to assimilate with the TL in spite of their being foreign language learners who experience rather restricted exposure and access to the TL. It seems to be a serendipitous yet confounding outcome that warrants further investigation.

7.2. Importance of the Research:
Theoretically, this study may contribute to the growing body of research on instructed ILP, by providing a study which endeavours to fill in the serious gap between interventional and developmental research in L2 pragmatics. Until the present, research in ILP has concentrated on the teachability of pragmatic competence, the need for teaching L2 pragmatics, and the efficacy of different instructional techniques to develop pragmatic competence in a single-moment research on one hand; if not on the other hand, it examined the pragmatic development of individual learners on a long-term. However, neither research paradigm has combined both perspectives. Unlike earlier research, this study extended the scope of its research to embrace an investigation of the learners’ pragmatic development on multiple of levels of knowledge:
perception, production, and attitude in a three-way interaction among pragmatic targets, mixed conditions of intervention, and the learners’ profiles. It contributes to the theory of ILP development by addressing both perspectives: the role of pragmatic instruction and the development of the learners’ pragmatic competence in a three-layer study.

Connected with the strand of research exploring the role of instruction in pragmatics in EFL contexts, this study contributes to the wealth of literature by providing a better understanding of the learners’ voice. It probed deeply and intensively into the learners’ attitudes in order to come to grips with the learners’ pragmatic bolsters and impediments. It examined their language learning experience telling how and why learning happens, exploring the role of learning and instruction in making meaning and reality. Realising the interplay between the pragmatic competence and attitude, this study adds the integrant of the learners’ voice together with perception and production as essential constituents of the learners’ pragmatic language learning experience.

Language learning behaviour is believed to be largely influenced by the learners’ attitude towards the TL and the TL community as well as the culture according to Gardner and Lambert (1972).

In terms of theories of knowledge and understanding, and typical of action research, this experimental undertaking provided ample knowledge that allows us to come to grips with some truths, solve problems in response to rapid changes and work out failures of previous models (McNiff, 2013). Therefore, it is an integral part of the teacher-researcher’s professional development and research their practice (Carr & Kemmis, 1986). It has been widely argued that Arab learners of English do not have the
awareness of the pragmatic differences between Arabic and English (Aribi, 2012; Umar, 2004; Scarcella, 1979), particularly in Egypt as an EFL context according to El Shazly (1993) and Halim (2000). Most of the available research on Arab learners of English tends to deal with their pragmatic knowledge and competence from a comparative perspective with NSs rather than a developmental one, except for a handful of studies. They outline how Arabic learners of English realise requests in their communication, their linguistic abilities, the strategies they prefer, and the influence of their culture on their application of the politeness. Even this handful of studies was concerned with the learners' language proficiency in relation to the level of their pragmatic acquisition rather than discussing their pragmatic development or identifying their stages of development. Needless to say, a gap in the literature is evident particularly in relation to interventional strands of research. Hardly any research is available that explores the Arabic learners of English attitudes towards their pragmatic acquisition experience, except that of Hamouda (2014) who explored the learners' production of refusals as well as their opinion of explicit instruction using self-reported diaries. Contributing to scholarly knowledge with rich and meticulous insights into the Egyptians EFL learners' attitudes towards their TL learning experience which mainly involves pragmatics instruction, this study adds to the literature of ILP research in general and EFL interventional research in particular. It probes deeply into Egyptian EFL learners' perception, production, and voice conflated to reflect on their pragmatic competence in a seminal undertaking that blends these three strands of knowledge together. This research contributes to the betterment of knowledge and informing decisions in education research and language
planning system in general and in foreign language teaching and learning in particular, using the active role of the researcher as an agent of change.

With reference to research methods and the instruments that may be used to elicit data, this research has contributed with the design of an original MDCT. Most of the situations used in the perception MDCT were adapted from different sources, namely, Parent (2002), Julie (1995), and Montserrat (1993). The MDCT questionnaire involves ten items and it is closed in format. Each item offers a hypothetical situation in which a request is employed. For each situation, there is a brief description as a prompt and then three alternative responses which include one key answer and two distractors. The most appropriate response, the key answer, is pragmalinguistically and sociopragmatically appropriate, whereas the distractors would be violating either the pragmalinguistic or the sociopragmatic features of the context in a random order. The distractors were created with one alternative that is socially appropriate but linguistically incorrect, and another that is socially inappropriate but linguistically correct. The learners were required to select the best response among three options that are available as possible rejoinders to the situation. The situations were familiar to the learners; they could possibly occur in their daily-life, so they are culturally appropriate and realistic. The situations were designed based on the three social parameters: P, SD, and SI. The parameters were limited to dichotomous variables (+/- P, +/-SD, +/-SI). All situations were of equal weight and complexity and the order of the situations was consigned randomly. The learners were required to make their evaluation on the requests employed in these situations, whether they are appropriate. These
questionnaires were piloted twice: once to NSs and another to NNS groups. Therefore, they were reviewed based on NS’ intuitions and comments (for further details see appendix A).

This study has valuable theoretical and pedagogical implications and applications for this under-investigated area. Schmidt highlights (2001: 30) “in order to acquire pragmatics, one must attend to both the linguistic forms of utterances and the relevant social and contextual features with which they are associated.” With only a limited amount of empirical research carried out in relation to the role of noticing in L2 acquisition and no clear interpretations, some researchers defied the foundations of the Noticing Hypothesis in cognitive psychology among whom is Truscott (1998). He disputed this strong view of the hypothesis preferring its weaker version which states that noticing is helpful but might not be necessary or vital for learning. Informed by Schmidt’s perspective of the development of pragmatic competence, this study challenges Truscott’s (1998) perspective. Using the learners’ production as well as their self-reported diaries, this study lends support to Schmidt’s Noticing Hypothesis (1993,1995, 2001) attesting that noticing and awareness are vital to the initiation of the cognitive processes, which leads to intake, L2 learning (see Chapter 5 and 6). Findings evinced that learners began to process input when they noticed particular pragmatic features (target pragmatic forms) in the input using raising awareness techniques, input enhancement, comparison between L1-L2, and metapragmatic explanation by drawing learners’ attention to the linguistic forms and the sociopragmatic variables of selected speech events. A case in point is HRAX, her selective attention was noted to enable her to pick what might or might not be learned where it was purposefully focused on the peripheries rather than the head-act of the requests (Al Khalil, 2011) (see Chapter 5).
Comparably, her diaries reveal assigning her undivided attention to pronunciation (her own learning agenda) which furthered her sense of alienation in the TL (see Chapter 6).

**7.3. Implications for Practitioners:**
As individuals aspired to understand other cultures, studying contexts such as those of TEFL became indispensable. Given that language is the backbone of society, studying it along with all its relatable issues is becoming pivotal, yet, it poses one of the insurmountable and implacable challenges to its apprentices. Teaching EFL learners is a daunting undertaking which involves imparting appropriate use of the TL which is highly bound to cultural values, situations, and interlocutors. It involves making learners competent users of the TL, cognisant of the differences and the similarities between their L1-L2. The present study revealed strong instructional role on learners’ learning of request-making expressions providing insights into ILP pedagogy and it also presents suggestions for EFL teachers and materials developers. With its applied aspects, this study offers insights into instruction in pragmatics in EFL contexts taking into consideration the learners’ voice that was relayed in the self-reported diaries.

From a pedagogical viewpoint, results of this study can be interpreted as a needs analysis to assist programme developers and syllabus designers in their L2 educational planning in order to reflect the learners’ communicative purposes and needs. The learners voiced their specific need for pragmatic instruction (to have their awareness raised to the TL secret social rules) to become more effective communicators in the TL interactions. They expressed their sincere desire and readiness to expend the required effort to communicate effectively. The results also indicated that these learners embraced a positive attitude
towards learning TL cultural features both from an overall perspective and from a specific one (affective, cognitive, behavioural); which in turn highlights their openness to acquire the TL (see Kim, 2016). L2 classroom research provides ample evidence that attests that motivation and positive attitude are key elements to successful attainment of L2 (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2013; Gass & Mackey, 2012; Brown, 2001, 2007). Therefore, it is widely recommended that EFL language teachers and practitioners should cater for their learners’ needs by developing appropriate a pragmatic-directed instructional approach to get the TL pragmatics right. What is more, they need to take the learners’ subjectivity into consideration while they are imparting these pragmatics-driven materials, where the learners’ self and L1 cultural identity should not be compromised, according to Gomez-Liach (2016).

Teachers and stakeholders including course developers might be able to make use of the learners’ voices that came out from the diary entries unfolding their inner process of learning. Employing these insightful voices about the challenges the learners confront, teachers and stakeholders may give substantial support to their learners (Taylor et al., 2013; Kikuchi, 2009). They are summoned to identify their learners’ difficulties as well as understand their needs and the fears which unfold in various situations. Accordingly, teachers and stakeholders are likely to be alert to the inner conflicts that their learners experience and it is possible that they make certain adjustments to accommodate their individual learning needs. They may also be given the opportunity to intervene in certain cases by counselling less motivated learners and bringing them back to be engaged in the
classroom activities through adjusting their expectations and expending more effort on their language learning experience.

With reference to materials’ developers and publishers, instruction in pragmatics should be considered and developed. Coursework in pragmatics and its instruction should become mandatory element in L2 teaching and learning. According to Barron (2016); Vellenga (2004); Alcón-Soler and Safont-Jorda (2001); Boxer and Pickering (1995); the current presentation of pragmatic issues in textbooks and course materials involved frequent pitfalls. It would be wise to seek authentic audio-visual input and naturally-induced data to arrive at appropriate and reliable TL linguistic forms, sociopragmatic variables, pragmatic meanings and rules (Alcón-Soler, 2008 a, b; Martínez-Flor, 2008). To make EFL learners more discerning about pragmatics, textbooks need to incorporate authentic materials relating to NS’ norms with meaningful opportunities for communication (Barron, 2016). These textbooks need to guide teachers and practitioners to employ practical techniques to integrate these pragmatic-driven materials into the classroom. According to Kasper (1997a:4), learners do not have to be essentially provided with new information, “but to make them [learners] aware of what they know already and encourage them to use their universal or transferable L1 pragmatic knowledge in L2 contexts”.

Another major teaching implication that could be realised from the present findings is the value of the teacher-researcher in teaching pragmatics in EFL contexts, who integrates her dual role as an educational practitioner and a researcher. The encouraging instructional gains that were revealed in the present study suggests that pragmatics instruction needs to be effectively incorporated in institutional curriculum, where language learners would be
served with better learning opportunities, catering for their demands. According to Cohen, A. (2012: 33), it is widely believed that there is “a noticeable gap between what research in pragmatics has found and how language is generally taught today”. Therefore, it is expected that the teacher-researcher should proceed and work on incorporating pragmatic instruction efficiently in curricula using authentic, audio-visual input and naturally-induced resources (Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015; Martínez-Flor, 2008). However, if the foreign language teacher is a NNS of the TL, it is recommended that these teachers should have pragmatics as part of their coursework and their teacher development programmes to avoid inadvertently imparting their erroneous pragmatic intuitions to their learners. If they are to adopt pragmatic-focused instruction, teachers and practitioners should be made cognisant of the TL pragmatics because they are part of the cyclic process that facilitates the learners’ pragmatic development. They should be sensitised to where they stand on their pragmatics awareness of the NSs’ benchmark norms.

It could be assumed that this experimental undertaking was able to generate some practically valid educational findings which might be used to effect some change in instruction in EFL contexts (Stenhouse, 1975). Serious questions are raised as to whether teaching English in EFL contexts should initiate a ground-breaking educational change in its perspective. Particularly in Egypt, teaching English as a foreign language should embrace a pragmatically-oriented curriculum and approach to language pedagogy. EFL language teachers and practitioners are advised to apply the findings of this study to help their learners become competent users of the TL, who are conversant of the crucial
pragmalinguistic and the socio-pragmatic conventions and patterns to communicate effectively in the TL.

It must be clarified that this study’s learners function as a particular group of EFL learners and that they are not meant to be representative of the whole group of EFL learners. A feature that is quintessential to action research (Koshy, 2005). Therefore, findings should be taken and applied with extra attention to the features of our sample group and differences should be catered for. Further research is highly recommended to reveal the EFL learners’ inner feelings and thoughts to provide them with the support they need in order to thrive in their L2 language learning experience. The need for change and improvement in the field is expected to motivate further research to bring about improvement in the situation.

7.4. Limitations of the Study:
The study has several limitations. The setting of the study is a higher education setting, which made random assignment of participants in groups difficult. In addition, the majority of the participants were Egyptian EFL learners with very few exceptions of one Syrian and one American learner. They were students in the Department of Humanities at the CLC, a college in one of the renowned and multicultural private universities in Cairo in Egypt, and thus findings may vary if the study was replicated in another context or to another group of participants. That is why the results and findings are not meant to be generalizable. Gender ratio was not controlled, because of the random sampling, yet the difference between the number of males and females in the two groups was not considered an extraneous variable that might have a substantial influence on the results of the study.
Regarding the narrow scope of the study, this research still focuses on a single pragmatic feature, that is to say requests. At this point, it is not clear whether learning one pragmatic feature might facilitate learning another. In other words, we are not sure whether the skills that the learners embraced from this study are likely to be transferred to another new situation or context, e.g. other areas such as ESP domains. Therefore, if the study were examining more than one pragmatic feature, the results would have been more robust and indicative to pragmatic competence learning. However, together with the body of the literature available of the role of instruction on EFL learners’ pragmatic competence development, it is believed that this shortcoming should be mitigated.

Moreover, the researcher designed the activity materials used in this study and she delivered them as well to her learners which may have induced some sort of researcher effect or bias. However, triangulation of the data should have alleviated this bias, if it existed (Denscombe, 2010). Bearing in mind Miles and Huberman’s (1994) report on the influence of the researcher’s presence and actions, it is likely that the researcher’s presence may influence the behaviour of the participants being observed. It is possible that they might have changed their behaviour to meet the researcher’s expectations and hide some sensitive information. However, the researcher attempted to spend more time with the learners to become less noticed and she shifted into a more investigative mode to unfold what might have been kept as discrete. However, the extent to which these techniques might have worked is inconclusive.
In addition, the design of the materials and the quality of instruction might differ in other contexts. With reference to the intervention, one caveat was detected which is that the learners were provided with various types of learning tasks; thus, it is almost impossible to detect which aspects of the intervention contribute the most to the positive effect of intervention (Lyster, 1994). Therefore, further research in other contexts with other interventional material is suggested to provide further indicative insights.

Regarding data collection instruments, DCT as an instrument, previously stood reliability tests. However, employing it for data collection, rather than other instruments such as role-plays, interviews, technologically-enhanced elicitation tools might also be limitations. With reference to the previously mentioned literature on DCT as a method of gathering data, it cannot be equated to natural speech (Tran, 2004; Beebe & Cummings, 1996). Notwithstanding, it is widely believed to gather large amounts of data, with ease of administration and construction, besides the straightforwardness of applying the coding taxonomy on it. However, the negative effect of the questionnaires on participants cannot be overlooked. A delimitation to this methodological shortcoming is that this study applied a well-established coding manual, CCSARP (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989) in addition to the self-reported diaries which probed into the learners’ voice to validate the findings of the DCT. Moreover, the situations employed in the DCT were very similar to the learners’ daily life situations in order to construct real-life context that they can relate to generate authentic language. Another shortcoming that might be identified is that for some learners, the context of the individual DCT items may have seemed to be insufficiently defined which may have posed some context vagueness. This may account for some of the inappropriateness that
was found in their performance. Therefore, further research into the minimum and the maximum details requirement is warranted. Another limitation with reference to the DCT involved the limited number of situations which may not be representative of all possible situations in real-life context. This limitation was considered and moderated in the design of the DCT in which an assortment of situations was selected mixing and matching the TL social parameters. For instance, formal and informal situations were included with mixed parameters, with high and low SD, P, SI. Thus, there was formal situations with (high SI, low P, low SD), (low SI, high P, low SD), (low SI, low P, high SD), (low SI, low P, low SD), (high SI, high P, high SD) and the same applies to informal situations. Also, the element of the learners’ fatigue and boredom was taken into consideration and catered for by limiting the number of the situations to those that are informative but not taxing. Finally, practice test effect was not well-managed, the order of the situations in the MDCT and the WDCT was supposed to be shuffled in order to minimise the practice test effect impact. A procedure if it had been followed, it would have ruled out any possibility that any gains after the intervention might have not been the result of the practice test effect. Therefore, further research into the methodology of data collection is warranted and recommended to face this challenge and elicit more spontaneous data, even in contrived settings, an everlasting concern in pragmatic research (Kasper, 2000; Gass, 2011).

A further limitation in the study’s methodology is that no delayed post-test gains were examined either qualitatively nor quantitatively. It would have been insightful to follow-up the robustness of the results in the long-term. Also, a stronger design would have had a control
group to eliminate the possibility of natural gains rather than the other design in which any change can be attributed to instruction.

Another limitation that was identified is that this study examined a contrived setting rather than a natural one. The impact of the instruction on the learners’ ability to cope with ‘socioculturally organised activities’ (LoCastro, 2003: 15) when communicating in real-life social interaction was not examined. The written DCT is not able to capture and assess the learners’ ability to use the language or the pragmatic knowledge in naturalistic social interaction examining features related to the interactive nature of conversation (Alcón-Soler & Guzman-Pitarch, 2013). In addition, there was no oral production task which asked learners to produce TL spontaneously, accessing higher processing demands with multiple levels of processing. The study has not expanded its scope of the instructional target from pragmatic knowledge to incorporate fluency, the processing efficiency in using this knowledge, a pragmatic feature with which our understanding of the instructional effects could have been well-supported. It could have been a more accurate representation of the learners’ performance if the extent to which the instruction assisted learners’ progress toward becoming a socioculturally competent user of the TL had been investigated later on in a natural setting. According to Taguchi (2015), rarely did anybody examine the impact of instruction or pragmatic development in the learners’ real-life, or go beyond post-test to real-life context. Future research to elicit and evaluate learners’ speech acts fluency in interaction and in naturalistic setting would be highly recommended.
7.5. Suggested Future Directions for Research in EFL Contexts:
Future empirical research is advised to take into consideration the kind, the amount, and the method of data collection. It should be borne into consideration that more natural speech should be elicited using more naturalistic non-intrusive means of gathering data. This is expected to elicit more rich and voluble data on the part of the participants with more interesting results (Maíz-Arévalo, 2015). Besides, a larger spectrum of the data would yield safer results with higher possibility for generalisation. Researchers might promote more reliable pragmatic assessment instruments rather than the available ones inducing real-life interactional data where multiple turns of interactions might be elicited illustrating how speakers and hearers negotiate meaning (Rose, 1992; Wolfson, 1989). They might be using meaningful communicative events to elicit such real-life data in more naturalistic setting.

Emboldening the learner’s identity and culture, Byram and Zarate (1994, 1997) along with Byram and Risager (1999); Byram et al. (2002) suggest the intercultural speaker (IS) rather than the NS as a point of reference in which the learners’ identity and culture are not marginalised. They add that the IS is likely to be less skilled in the TL linguistic skills; however, they have the advantage of being able to interact and handle people with different cultures and different languages. The IS is believed to be able to reconcile differences among cultures and borders (Wilkinson, 2012). Embracing more of a dynamic concept where knowledge and acquisition is constant, ISs are allowed to retain their own cultural, linguistic and social legacies rather than compromising the TL standards as a sole target. Future empirical research should be directed towards intercultural communicative competence (ICC), as a relevant goal of language teaching given the growing
communication across cultures. It should also probe into the learners’ self and their cultural identity to find out the conscious and the subconscious reasons behind diverging from NSs’ pragmatic norms (Gomez-Liach, 2016).

Research should also be directed towards pedagogical frameworks that promote strategy instruction in pragmatics using naturalistic data and engaging learners in meaningful communicative activities (see Ishihara & Cohen, A., 2014). Research should reflect on large communicative patterns in the TL culture by analysing and interpreting them, accruing the employed pragmatic patterns and behaviours real-life language use. It might be useful to include technology platforms such as Blackboard, Web CT, and Moodle to create authentic language use with a more naturalistic setting where NSs may be involved to scaffold NNSs’ language learning (Johnson & deHaan, 2013; Skyes, 2009, 2013; Taguchi & Skyes, 2013; Macrory et al., 2012; Wishnoff, 2000). Using meaningful communicative events, learners may be given the chance to communicate with NSs synchronously or asynchronously. This direction of research should assist learners to take the initiative and the responsibility for their own learning outside of the instructional environment. It has to investigate their autonomy and their independent learning allowing them to monitor their own subjective language learning process in which they can identify and cater for their individual weaknesses besides boosting their points of strength.

Additional research should also embrace multiple pragmatic targets as its focus of attention in order to capture the interaction between the pragmatic targets and the instructional effects. Researchers like Skyes (2009, 2013) as well as Johnson and deHaan (2013) are
among the very few who have directed their research towards multiple pragmatic targets to a specimen of participants to assess pragmatic competence on multi-layered aspects. Findings should be reported separately to elicit insights into the behavioural patterns governing these speech acts and routines. They should empirically report on their amenability to instruction and whether their conjoining together in interactional patterns may influence their level of imperviousness to teaching while negotiating meaning. Directing further research towards examining more than one pragmatic feature would provide more robust and indicative results to pragmatic competence learning.

Further studies could be designed to go beyond post-test exploring real-world language use by adding a delayed-post-test to explore the impact and the robustness of the instructional gains in the TL. It should attempt to construct links between instruction and the real-world language use by investigating whether instruction has facilitated the learners’ ability to cope with real-life social interactions by going beyond the L2 classroom contrived setting. Researchers need to approach technology platforms to relate instruction to authentic language use. Researchers, language teachers and practitioners must expand their horizons. Thus, it is likely that they would advance the current practices of pragmatic instruction and development by conducting further research and investigation with the objective of optimising and accruing knowledge that can assist them in supporting and reassuring their learners in this daunting undertaking.

7.6. Conclusion:
This study provides a multi-layered and vibrant depiction of EFL learners receiving higher education in Egypt. It expands one of the notable socio-cognitive approaches, Schmidt's
(1992, 1993, 1995, 2001) Noticing Hypothesis, and applies it to a non-western context. The contribution of this research is that it combined three-way investigation of perception, production, and voice, a seminal undertaking that has not, to my knowledge, previously been attempted in Egypt or the Middle East EFL contexts altogether. Connected with the strands of research exploring the role of instruction in pragmatics in EFL contexts, this study provides fine-grained insights into the EFL learners’ attitudes and the challenges they confront in their L2 pragmatic development using exploration and grounded-theory. Exploring voice and attitudes in pragmatics is seminal, because few studies have investigated this domain in pragmatic acquisition and development. Using combination of MDCT, WDCT, and self-reported diaries as methods of data collection in pragmatic instruction is significant because hardly any research has employed this three-fold combination to investigate ILP development.

In essence, this research has provided robust empirical support to the facilitative role of pragmatic instruction in EFL contexts which houses noticing as a necessary condition for learning in pragmatics. It advocates early attention to pragmatic instruction as an effective means to ameliorate foreign language learners’ evolving communicative abilities. Embracing favourable attitudes towards the TL along with maintaining high levels of motivation, the majority of the current study’s learners were capable of thriving during the arduous process of foreign language learning achieving substantial gains in different respects. A flexible and low-anxiety language classroom atmosphere where learners felt recognised and valued has enhanced the emergence and the co-construction of the learners’ new identities in the TL.
Awareness of TL norms and behaviours prevents learners from experiencing negative feelings of inadequacy and helplessness, where they might answer a greeting of ‘how are you?’ by saying something about their welfare instead of saying ‘great, see you around’ (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001). Comparably, NNSs are likely to miss the illocutionary force of a shop assistant offering help saying ‘are you OK?’ replying with something like ‘well, yes, I am OK, how about you?’.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A: Recognition MDCT

Ten situations are described below. Please read the brief description of each situation and what is said (as responses) in that situation. There are three possible responses. Choose the most appropriate one.

If there is something you do not understand, ask your teacher she will explain it to you.

Situation 1
You have a paper due in one of your courses next week. However, you will be very busy this week and you do not have any time to write it. You go to your professor's office to ask more time to write the paper. What would you say to your professor?

You would say:
A. "I really want to put my best into this paper, and the problem is that I have a lot to do over this week. I need a day of extension; I would like to devote more time in it."
B. “Hi there, Dr. Williams. I was wondering if I could talk to you for a minute? I was wondering if it might be possible for me to turn in paper four on Wednesday rather than this Tuesday. I've got an exam on Wednesday and I don't think I'll have enough time to do a good job on it Tuesday…
C. “I want to extend the deadline for submitting my paper to Wednesday.”

Situation 2
You are trying to study for an exam, which will take place tomorrow. However, your neighbour, who is also a student from your school, but whom you have never met, is playing his music very loudly, and you cannot concentrate. The library is closed and there is no place, where you can study except in your apartment. What would you say to that student?

You would say:
A. "Turn the music down."
B. “I want you to turn the music down if you like I've got some headphones you can borrow.”
C. “Excuse me, I am studying for an exam that I'm going to take tomorrow and it's a bit hard for me to study because I keep hearing your music... I'm sorry but do you think you could please turn down the music a little bit, just for tonight?”

Situation 3
You are at a record store with your best friend. There is a CD you really want to buy, but you do not have any money. What would you say to your friend to ask him to lend you the money?
You would say:
A. "Andy, lend me 40 LE … I really want to get this new Daft Punk CD."
B. “Andy, I'm wondering if I could ask you a favour? I want to buy the new Daft Punk CD and I actually don't have the money to buy it now… so I was wondering if you could possibly lend me 40 LE so that I can buy it and I'll pay you back next Tuesday?”
C. “Andy, shall you lend me 40 LE so that I can buy this new Daft Punk CD?”

Situation 4
Your mother will be arriving from a very long trip today, and you want to pick her up at the airport. However, her flight arrives at 3.00 PM, but you have to work until 5.00. What would you say to your boss to ask her to let you out of work early?

You would say:
A. “Jane, I wonder if I could talk to you? My mum is actually visiting me this holiday and she'll be coming today and maybe Jill can substitute for me? Is it OK by you?”
B. "Hello Jane, I have to leave early to run important errand today."
C. “Hello Jane, I was wondering if I could talk to you for a minute? My mum is actually visiting me this holiday and she'll be arriving today. I need to go to the airport and I was wondering if maybe Jill could substitute for me? I've already prepared everything and I've talked to Jill and she said that she could do it and I was wondering if it would be alright for you?”

Situation 5
You are playing tennis at the college tennis court one afternoon with a friend. Unfortunately, he is just a beginner and is not very good. At one point during the game, he accidentally hits the ball over the fence into the next court where some other children are playing. You need the ball back. What would you say to one of the children playing in that court to get them to give the ball back?

You would say:
A. “Hi there!!!! Shall throw the ball?”
B. "Hey kids, shall you throw that ball back over here, please…"
C. “Hi there!!!! Can you help us please? Our ball went over the fence; do you think you could get it for us?”
Situation 6
You are taking a course. Last week you missed a few classes since you had a bad cold. A mid-term exam is scheduled for next week. You know that one of your classmates attends classes regularly and takes good notes. You approach him. What would you say to that classmate to get him to give you his notes?
You would say:
A. "I need to photocopy your notes"
B. “Hi Andy! Do you think I could possibly photocopy your notes? I missed a couple of classes and I'm very worried about the test next week"
C. “Hi buddy! May I photocopy your notes?

Situation 7
You are typing a term paper on a computer. Suddenly, the computer breaks down, and you do not know how to fix it. The paper needs to be submitted tomorrow because the professor will be out of town for a while. You know that your friend has the same computer as you. You want to ask her to let you use her computer to type your term paper. What would you say to that friend to get him/her to allow you to use the computer?
You would say:
A. "Hi Dave, my computer broke down, I have a term paper due tomorrow, I don't know what to do!!! I will use your computer to finish typing my paper. Is that ok?"
B. “Hi Dave, you know my computer broke down, I have a term paper due tomorrow, I don't know what to do!!! Do you mind use your computer to finish typing my paper? Is that ok?"
C. “Hi Dave! I'm having some big problems with my computer, it crashed and I can't fix it!! Do you think I could use your computer for about two hours so I can finish a paper I'm writing?"

Situation 8
You are taking a course from a professor whom you have never seen before. Today is the first day of class. The professor talks about important things such as textbooks, assignments and exams. Since the classroom is rather large and the professor speaks with a soft voice, you can't hear him well. What would you say to that professor to get him to speak with a louder voice?
You would say:
A. "Excuse me, Dr. Dave, speak louder, it's impossible to hear you."
B. "Dr. Dave please speak bit louder, I can't hear you here."
C. “Excuse me, Dr. Dave, do you think you could please raise your voice? I’m having a bit of trouble hearing you.”

**Situation 9**

For the first time this term you are taking an Economics course. You have had a hard time following lectures and understanding the textbook. An exam is scheduled for next week. You notice that one student who is sitting next to you seems to have good background knowledge of economics, and is doing well. Since it is the beginning of the semester, you do not know him yet. You want to ask him to study together for the upcoming exam. What would you say to get her to suggest you study together?

**You would say:**

A. "Hey there, you look like you know what you’re doing. Interested in studying together? I’ll buy you a coffee!"

B. “Hey there! How’s it going in the class? I’m finding it a bit hard right now; I don’t really understand some things. How about we can study together?

C. “Hey there! How’s it going in the class? I’m finding it a bit hard right now; I don’t really understand some things. Do you think that maybe we could get together sometime and I could ask you a few questions?”

**Situation 10**

As a part-time job, you are working as a library monitor. While checking on each floor in the library, you see that a group of students whom you do not know talking loudly in a non-discussion area. It seems clear that this loud noise is disturbing other students who are studying. You want the noisy students to be quiet or move to a discussion area. What would you say to get them to be quiet or to move to the discussion area?

**You would say:**

A. "You’re being too loud, move to a discussion area. Library rules guys!"

B. “Hi there, I’m sorry but I think there are some people who are trying to concentrate here, and unfortunately this is a not talking area… I was wondering if you could please move to a discussion area on the second floor if you’d like to keep talking?"

C. “Hi there, I was thinking if you please move to a discussion area on the second floor as you’d like to carry on talking.”

Suggested replies were constructed by researcher and then piloted to native speakers to elicit their intuitions, then all required modifications were done based on their insights.
Table 1: Recognition MDCT Situations and Size of Imposition (SI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual setting</th>
<th>Size of Imposition</th>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Social situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>High SI (+ SI)</td>
<td>Item no.1</td>
<td>Student asks a professor for more time to write a due paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.4</td>
<td>Employee asks her boss to let her out of work early to pick up her mother from airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.7</td>
<td>Speaker asks her friend to let you use her computer to type your term paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.8</td>
<td>Student asks his professor to speak a bit louder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Medium to Low SI (+/- SI)</td>
<td>Item no.2</td>
<td>Student asks a neighbour, who is also a student from same school, to turn the music down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD shop</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.3</td>
<td>Speaker asks his friend to lend him 40 LE to buy his favourite CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.5</td>
<td>Speaker asks one of the children playing in a nearby tennis court to get him the ball that he has thrown back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.6</td>
<td>Student asks a classmate to photocopy his notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.9</td>
<td>Student asks a new colleague to study together for the upcoming exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.10</td>
<td>Library monitor asks noisy students to be quiet or move to a discussion area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key words related to +/- SI are highlighted in bold.

Table 2: Recognition MDCT Situations and Social Distance (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual setting</th>
<th>Social Distance</th>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Social situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>High SD (+SD)</td>
<td>Item no.5</td>
<td>Speaker asks one of the children playing in a nearby tennis court to get him the ball that he has thrown back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.9</td>
<td>Student asks a new colleague to study together for the upcoming exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.10</td>
<td>Library monitor asks noisy students to be quiet or move to a discussion area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Medium to Low SD (+/- SD)</td>
<td>Item no.1</td>
<td>Student asks a professor for more time to write a due paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.2</td>
<td>Student asks a neighbour, who is also a student from same school, to turn the music down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD shop</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.3</td>
<td>Speaker asks his friend to lend him 40 LE to buy his favourite CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.4</td>
<td>Employee asks her boss to let her out of work early to pick up her mother from airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.6</td>
<td>Student asks a classmate to photocopy his notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.7</td>
<td>Speaker asks a friend to let you use her computer to type your term paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.8</td>
<td>Student asks his professor to speak a bit louder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key words related to +/- SD are highlighted in bold.
Table 3: Recognition MDCT Situations and Power Issues (P)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual setting</th>
<th>Power Issues</th>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Social situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>High power (HP) (+P)</td>
<td>Item no.1</td>
<td>Student asks a professor for more time to write a due paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.4</td>
<td>Employee asks her boss to let her out of work early to pick up her mum from airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.5</td>
<td>Speaker asks one of the children playing in a nearby tennis court to get him the ball that he has thrown back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.8</td>
<td>Student asks his professor to speak a bit louder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.10</td>
<td>Library monitor asks noisy students to be quiet or move to a discussion area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Medium to Low power (MP) (+/- P)</td>
<td>Item no.2</td>
<td>Student asks a neighbour, who is also a student from same school, to turn the music down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD shop</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.3</td>
<td>Speaker asks his friend to lend him 40 LE to buy his favourite CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.6</td>
<td>Speaker asks a classmate to photocopy his notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.7</td>
<td>Speaker asks a friend to let you use her computer to type your term paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.9</td>
<td>Student asks a new colleague to study together for the upcoming exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key words related to +/- P are highlighted in bold.

According to Brown and Levinson, (1987, cited in Brubak, 2013: 11) as well as Fraser (1990: 230), choosing the most appropriate strategies to realise a request depends on the relationship among three intertwined variables namely, size of imposition (SI) of the request in the culture of the FL, social distance (SD) between the speaker and the hearer, and relative power (P) of the speaker in relation to the hearer. Working out these variables would definitely facilitate the calculation of the seriousness and the weight of the face-threatening act (FTA). These variables reflect the speaker’s assumptions of them not the actual SD, P or SI; in fact, they are the speaker’s projections of these features.
Analysis of the recognition MDCT

In the recognition/perception questionnaire, items numbers 1-10 investigate varying degrees of size of imposition (SI). Especially scenarios no.1, no.4, no.7, and no.8 are high size of imposition (HSI). Scenarios no.2, no.3, no.5, no.6, no.9, and no.10 are medium to low size of imposition (MSI) (see Table 2) in appendix A.

With reference to Table 1, this MDCT should allow for the evaluation of the participants’ ability to recognise the size of imposition as one of the pragmatic aspects, the participants need to consider while judging the ten situations at hand. Certain key words that denote high size of imposition such as ask for ‘more time’, ‘let her out of work early’, ‘use her personal computer’, are employed to make participants notice them while making their judgments. By choosing the appropriate rejoinder to the situation, by recognising the most appropriate request, speech act, the participants manifest their ability to perceive these pragmatic aspects in the situation, including the size of imposition.

As for the social distance (SD) in the MDCT, items no.1, no.2, no.4, no.5, no.6, no.8, no.9, and no.10 probe various degrees of this distance. Items no.5, 9 and 10 explore high social distance (HSD), whereas items 1, 2, 3, 4, 6,7 and 8 investigate medium to low social distance (MSD) (see Table 2) in appendix A.

Regarding Table 2, this MDCT should allow for the evaluation of the participants’ ability to recognise the social distance as one of the pragmatic aspects, the participants need to consider while judging the ten situations at hand. Certain key words that denote the relative familiarity such as ask for ‘new colleague’, ‘neighbour’, ‘classmate’, ‘friend’, etc. are used. Participants were required to notice them while making their judgments. By choosing the
appropriate rejoinder to the situation, by recognising the most appropriate request, speech act, the participants manifest their ability to perceive these pragmatic aspects in the situation, including the social distance.

Regarding the power (P) in the Recognition questionnaire, items no.1, no.4, no.5, no.8, no.9, and no.10. Items no.1, 4, 5, 8, and 10 explore high power (HP), whereas items no.2,3,6,7 and 9 look into medium to low power (MP) (see Table 3) in appendix A. Item no.3 is a distractor in which it had almost no high size of imposition, no social distance, and no power. It exemplifies the absence of these three features to the participants.

Regarding Table 3, this MDCT should allow for the evaluation of the participants’ ability to recognise the power issues involved as one of the pragmatic aspects, the participants need to consider while judging the ten situations at hand. Certain key words that denote the relative power such as ask for ‘professor’, ‘her boss’, ‘one of the children’, ‘a librarian’, etc. are utilised to make participants notice them while making their judgments. By choosing the appropriate rejoinder to the situation, by recognising the most appropriate request, speech act, the participants manifest their ability to perceive these pragmatic aspects in the situation, including the power relations.

As for the content of the illustrated situations, they all referred to scenarios that were expected to be familiar to speakers across cultures whether Eastern or Western cultures. Each questionnaire was preceded by instructions asking the participants to respond to the different situations as spontaneously as possible.
Appendix B: Production WDCT

Eight situations are described below. Please read the brief description of each situation and write down what you would say in that situation. Say as much or as little as you wish in an actual situation.

There is no right or wrong answer, and sometimes more than one answer is appropriate. It is important that you understand the situation fully. If there is something you do not understand, ask the teacher, he/she will explain it to you.

**Situation 1**
You are studying at home. Your younger brother opens the window and the cold wind blows right into your face and bothers you. You want to ask him to close it. What would you say?
You:
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

**Situation 2**
In the study centre, you are working with your classmates preparing a group presentation. You are deciding who will take responsibility for which part of the presentation. Your friend is very good with computers. You want to ask him to design the PowerPoint slides. What would you ask him?
You:
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
**Situation 3**
At the tutor’s office, you have just received an essay back and want to discuss it with your tutor. She is very busy. You go to your tutor’s office after the class. You want to make an appointment to see her as soon as possible. What would you ask?
You:
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

**Situation 4**
You really have to take this course in order to graduate, but you found that the course is already closed. So, you decide to ask the professor, whom you don’t know, to allow you to take this course. What would you say to get this professor to permit you to participate in this course?
You:
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

**Situation 5**
On campus, you have a lecture in Engineering Building but don’t know where the building is. You stop another student (who you don’t know) on campus. You want directions to the building. What would you ask?
You:
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
**Situation 6**
Your class has just finished and you need a lift home. Your fellow-classmate who was supposed to give you a lift is absent. As you come out of the class, you see another classmate who lives in the same area of yours. You decide to ask him for a lift home. What would you say?
You:
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
**Situation 7**
Your friend and you go to a restaurant to eat. You want to order and need to ask the waiter for the menu. What would you say?
You:
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
**Situation 8**
You are the president of a university. Something is wrong with your computer. You have to finish some work that is due tomorrow. One of the students is very skilful in fixing computers. You don’t know him. However, you want to ask him to fix your computer. What would you say?
You:
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
Table 4: Production WDCT Situations and Size of Imposition (SI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual setting</th>
<th>Size of Imposition</th>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Social situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>High SI (+ SI)</td>
<td>Item no.2</td>
<td>On preparing a group presentation, a student had to assign tasks to members of his group. His friend is very good with computers and he wants him to design the power point slides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.3</td>
<td>A student wants to discuss his writing assignment with her tutor. She asks for an appointment with her busy tutor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.4</td>
<td>A student asks his professor to register him on an essential core course, though it has already closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.8</td>
<td>The president of one of the universities asks a very skilful student to fix his computer, so that he would be able to finish some urgent work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Medium to Low SI (+/− SI)</td>
<td>Item no.1</td>
<td>A student asks her younger brother to close the window that is blowing very cold wind into her face (there is a draught).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.5</td>
<td>A student has a lecture in Engineering building, but he does not know where it is. He stops another student asks him to give him directions to go there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.6</td>
<td>A student asks her classmate for a lift home on her way back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.7</td>
<td>A student and his friend go to a restaurant and they ask the waiter for the menu to make their order.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key words referring to +/- SI are highlighted in bold.

Table 5: Production WDCT situations and social distance (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual setting</th>
<th>Social Distance (SD)</th>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Social situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>High SD (+ SD)</td>
<td>Item no.4</td>
<td>A student asks a professor (whom you don’t know) to register him on an essential core course, though it has already closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.5</td>
<td>A student has a lecture in Engineering building, but he does not know where it is. He stops another student that he does not know asks him to give him the directions to go there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.7</td>
<td>A student and his friend go to a restaurant and they ask the waiter for the menu to make their order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.8</td>
<td>The president of one of the universities asks a very skilful student to fix his computer, so that he would be able to finish some urgent work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Medium to Low SD (+/− SD)</td>
<td>Item no.1</td>
<td>A student asks her younger brother to close the window that is blowing very cold wind into her face (there is a draught).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.2</td>
<td>On preparing a group presentation, a student had to assign tasks to members of his group. His friend is very good with computers and he wants him to design the power point slides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.3</td>
<td>A student wants to discuss his writing assignment with her tutor. She asks for an appointment with her busy tutor, though.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.6</td>
<td>A student asks her classmate for a lift home on her way back.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key words referring to +/- SI are highlighted in bold.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual setting</th>
<th>Power issues (P)</th>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Social situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>High P (+ P)</td>
<td>Item no.1</td>
<td>A student asks her younger brother to close the window that is blowing very cold wind into her face (there is a draught).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.2</td>
<td>On preparing a group presentation, a student had to assign tasks to members of his group. His friend is very good with computers and he wants him to design the power point slides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.3</td>
<td>A student wants to discuss his writing assignment with her tutor. She asks for an appointment with her busy tutor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Medium to Low P (+/- P)</td>
<td>Item no.4</td>
<td>A student asks his professor to register him on an essential core course, though it has already closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.5</td>
<td>A student has a lecture in Engineering building, but he does not know where it is. He stops another student asks him to give him the directions to go there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.6</td>
<td>A student asks her classmate for a lift home on her way back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item no.7</td>
<td>A student and his friend go to a restaurant and they ask the waiter for the menu to make their order.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key words referring to +/- P are highlighted in bold.
**Analysis of the WDCT**

In the production questionnaire, items numbers 1-8 investigate dual degrees of size of imposition (SI), either high or medium to low SI. In particular, scenarios numbers 2-4 and no.8 are high size of imposition (HSI). Scenarios no.1, as well as numbers 5-7 are medium to low size of imposition (MSI) (see Table 4) in appendix B.

Regarding Table 4, this WDCT should allow for the evaluation of the participants’ ability to produce an appropriate request meanwhile calculating the whole situation with all its parameters including the size of imposition. The participants would manifest their ability to take a further step after the recognition, appropriate production, by writing down their projected responses in such situations bearing in mind the pragmatic aspects of the situation. Certain key words that denote the size of imposition such as ‘design slides’, ‘make an appointment’, ‘fix his computer’, etc. are employed and it is expected that the participants would notice them while producing the request in writing.

As for the social distance (SD) in the Recognition questionnaire, all eight items probe twofold degrees of this distance. Items no.4, no.5, no.7, and no.8 explore high social distance (HSD), whereas items numbers 1-3 and item no.6 investigate medium to low social distance (MSD) (see Table 5) in appendix B.

With reference to Table 5, this WDCT should allow for the evaluation of the participants’ ability to produce an appropriate request meanwhile calculating the whole situation with all its parameters including the social distance. The participants would manifest their ability to take a further step after the recognition, appropriate production, by writing down what they would say in such situations bearing in mind the pragmatic aspects of the situation. Certain key words that denote the social distance such as ‘a professor whom you don’t know’, ‘to a waiter’, etc. are
used, and the participants are expected to notice them while producing the request in writing. Regarding the power (P) in the Recognition questionnaire, the eight items examine the dual values of power. Items no.1-3, and item no.8 explore high power (HP), whereas items numbers 4-7 look into medium to low power (MP) (see Table 6) in appendix B.

With reference to Table 6, this WDCT should allow for the evaluation of the participants’ ability to produce an appropriate request meanwhile calculating the whole situation with all its parameters including the power issues. The participants would manifest their ability to take a further step after the recognition, appropriate production, by writing down what they would say in such situations bearing in mind the pragmatic aspects of the situation. Certain key words that denote the power issues such as ‘her younger brother’, ‘a group member’, etc. are utilised to grab the participants’ attention to these situational parameters while producing the request in writing.
Appendix C: Questions to Solicit Diaries’ Writing

Every other week of this intervention, you will keep a journal of your growing awareness and understanding of the pragmatic content of English conversations based on the discussions we study in class, and those that you participate in or listen to. You will also comment on the differences between the pragmatic content of equivalent situations in your language (Arabic).

Your bi-weekly entry will be approximately 50-100 words, and include examples that you have analysed pragmatically. This Journal will be submitted in week 9. You are allowed to write your entries either in English or in Arabic.

To assist you with your journal writing, answer the following questions:

Core questions: (Given in week 2)

1. Discuss how do the pragmatic features, we study in class, help your understanding of spoken English and interaction?
2. Do you think the given classroom examples and learning materials proved useful to your language learning? Discuss highlighting two instances.
3. Compare and contrast the situations we come across in English to your own language and culture?

In the beginning: (Given in week 4)

1. In what ways do you enjoy or dislike meeting and listening people who speak English? Provide at least one example.
2. Why would you like to learn English? Provide at least two reasons.

In the middle: (Given in week 6)

1. In what way has learning about pragmatics been useful for you as a participant in English conversations?
2. In what sense do you feel your understanding about pragmatics has differed than at the beginning of semester?

In the end: (Given in week 8)

1. Do you think this course provided you with cultural awareness of the English speaking culture? In what ways?
2. In your opinion, which section of the learning materials do you find helpful in building your confidence in using English with native speakers? Discuss using at least one example.

Based on Attitude/Motivation Test Battery sample (AMTB) of Gardner and Macintyre (1991)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Type of question &amp; Timing</th>
<th>Kind of evaluation</th>
<th>Construct measured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Discuss how do the pragmatic features, we study in class, help your understanding of spoken English and interaction?</td>
<td>- Open-ended, - Given in Week 2</td>
<td>A summative question, which allows both the researcher and the learners to evaluate the level of success that has been obtained at the end of the interventional unit.</td>
<td>Examining the learners’ desire to learn the pragmatic component of the language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you think this course provided you with cultural awareness of the English speaking culture? In what ways?</td>
<td>- Open-ended, - Given in Week 8</td>
<td>A formative question, which allows the learners with realisation concerning their developments in their learning context with special focus on their cultural consciousness of English.</td>
<td>Exploring the learners’ attitudes toward the learning situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you think the given classroom examples and learning materials proved useful to your language learning? Discuss highlighting two instances.</td>
<td>- Open-ended, - Given in Week 2</td>
<td>A formative question, which provides both the researcher and the learners with discernments as per their progress in the ongoing teaching and learning contexts.</td>
<td>Investigating the learners’ attitudes toward the learning situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In what sense do you feel your understanding about pragmatics has differed than at the beginning of semester?</td>
<td>- Open-ended, - Given in Week 6</td>
<td>A summative question, which allows the learners to evaluate the importance of acquiring the functional component of the TL at the end of the interventional unit. Notably, the researcher is given insights about the learners’ perception of their own progress and learning that would further be compared to their actual developments.</td>
<td>Examining the learners’ attitudes toward the learning situation and the need to acquire the functional component of the TL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In what way has learning about pragmatics been useful for you as a participant in English conversations?</td>
<td>- Open-ended, - Given in Week 6</td>
<td>A summative question, which allows the learners to evaluate the level of success that has been obtained at the end of the interventional unit on the pragmatic level, their ability to communicate using the language in a more appropriate manner. Noteworthy, the researcher’s analyses of the other tools concerning the learners’ pragmatic competence development could be falsified.</td>
<td>Investigating the learners’ desire to learn the pragmatic component of the language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Compare and contrast the situations we come across in English to your own language and culture?</td>
<td>- Open-ended, - Given in Week 2</td>
<td>A formative question, which sensitises the learners with the differences between the two cultures and thus language use.</td>
<td>Exploring the learners’ awareness of the cultural difference between their L1 and the TL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. In your opinion, which section of the learning materials do you find helpful in building your confidence in using English with native speakers? Discuss using at least one example.

- Open-ended
- Given in Week 8

A formative question, which builds and fosters the learners’ sense of self-confidence in foreign language learning context

Examining the learners’ sense of anxiety and confidence in the TL

8. In what ways do you enjoy or dislike meeting and listening people who speak English? Provide at least one example.

- Open-ended
- Given in Week 4

A formative question, which prompts the learners to explore their own interest in foreign language learning context.

Exploring the learners’ interest in learning foreign language

9. Why would you like to learn English? Provide at least two reasons.

- Open-ended
- Given in Week 4

A formative question, which offers both the researcher and the learners with insights with respect to whether they are motivated to learn English as a foreign language.

Investigating the importance of learning English as a foreign language to the learners
Appendix D: Tasks and Activities Used in the Intervention

The intervention involves a variety of tasks and activities, which aim at exposing the learners to the appropriate native-like production (model input). They also aim at reinforcing and consolidating that kind of knowledge (pragmatic knowledge).

1. **Teacher-fronted discussion** which is one of the tasks that was used in the intervention. Learners were given explicit metapragmatic comments on the various situations via native speakers. The meaning of requests was examined in depth inductively and deductively as well as how to work out the performance parameters. Some relevant pragmatic issues were highlighted, such as a single utterance might have different meanings or may be realised by different forms in various contexts.

2. **Pragmatic-focused tasks** are tasks that were employed in which pertinent metapragmatic information was imparted in small-group discussions based on a variety of videotaped or audiotaped situations conducted by NSs.

3. **L1-L2 comparisons of requests** is another activity that was utilised. The learners had been given a situation or two in their native language and they were asked to make a request based on this situation(s) in their L1. Afterwards, they attempted to make a request based on the same situation(s) in the L2. Comparisons across the different formulas, the language and the strategies used in both languages were made to spot the similarities and differences. Thus they were exposed to when, where, how, and why requests are used differently across languages and cultures.

4. **Role-play** is another activity that was employed in which some learners were asked to volunteer to role-play a situation that would involve using a request. Then, feedback was given by encouraging other students to give their insights based on the inner-criteria that they have developed. Error correction, explicit pragmatic feedback was induced in small group discussions under my supervision and facilitation. Learners were asked to give their account of how they perceived other learners’ production from different perspectives, across the different cultural norms.

5. **Small group discussions/pair-work** is another activity where the class was divided into small groups. Each group was required to come up with the appropriate request based on situations. Then, they were asked to compare and contrast the strategies they used. They argued providing enough support why they deem these strategies as appropriateness or inappropriateness.
6. The learners were provided with written dialogues that were conducted by NSs and then they were asked to identify and underline the speech act used. Then they had to determine whether the request is appropriate or not and to provide other alternatives if possible.
Appendix E: Sample Tasks and Activities

Session two: Lesson plan: (110 minutes)

1. Warm-Up stage: (25-30 min)

   - **The purpose:** to activate the learners’ schemata by eliciting information regarding what they already know about requests and the difference between their L1 and L2. Learners were primarily instructed with learning targets on what making a request involves.

   - **Learners** were exposed to appropriate input, NSs’ requests via videos excerpts. They were instructed to answer some *preparatory questions*, which are meaning focused as in: written on the white board- to elicit answers inductively (administration)

   1. What does a request involve? (Interlocutors: requester-requestee + Illocutionary force)
   2. How can you grab someone’s attention to direct a request to him or her? (Alerter)
   3. How would you bring your hearer to cooperate with you? (modification strategies)
   4. What are the constituents of the request?

   - They were *explicitly* instructed to what a request is, highlighting the importance of *modification devices* and their *types* and *tools*.

   The types of strategies that can be used when requesting were highlighted and whether the forms are direct, conventionally indirect or non-conventionally indirect along with the softening devices that accompany these requests.

2. Pragmatic consciousness-raising stage: (40-45 min)

   - The learners were requested to work in pairs or small groups to recognise both the pragmalinguistic forms and the sociopragmatic factors (size of imposition, social distance, and power) that influence the appropriateness of request mitigating or aggravating devices. Here it should be noted that power, social distance, and size of imposition as parameters of the politeness theory. They were brought to listen to dialogues in L2 in which segments of the speech act of request are embedded as examples of the forms of modification.
Variety of activities was used to develop both the learners’ awareness of cross-cultural and cross-linguistic differences between their native language and the TL, as well as their pragmatic awareness. Using raising-awareness activities, learners should be asked to think about requests that are used in daily L1 interactions in academic life situations, daily-life interactions etc. with special focus on both the linguistic manifestations and the sociopragmatic features in which the request is embedded.

A number of elicitation questions were employed referring to the learners’ L1 and culture, as in:

1- What do people say to express requests in your first language?
2- While requesting something from someone in your first language, do you take into consideration the status of the person you are requesting from?

3. Communicative practice stage: (25-30 min)

Learners were provided with written and oral opportunities to use request strategies and modification devices in simulated communicative contexts.

Learners were presented with written situation, rich in pragmatic information, and they were required make a request to the particular person indicated in the situation. The learners were requested to ponder on the social distance between the characters, the speaker's power over the hearer, the imposition involved in the request.

Learners were asked to work in pairs and act out in a role-play fashion how the situation is likely to follow to make room for more authenticity and break away from the contrived context of the classroom. They were presented with a wide variety of situations with differing sociopragmatic features in a timely fashion in order to observe whether these variables affect their choice of the request strategy and its modification devices.
Informative feedback and metapragmatic reflection on the learners’ performance to further sharpen their understanding of the pragmatic issue under instruction to correct any inappropriate use of target items.

The learners’ ability to reflect on their own pragmatic development would be recorded in their self-reported diaries.

Authentic language is employed.

Being able to figure out the intention of the speaker is part of being communicatively competent.
Week two (session 2)
Making A Request
Activities

Task 1:
**Complete the dialogue using a word or a phrase:**
**Dialogue 1: Burning a CD**
Girl: ____________________! ____________________ help me?
Man: Sure. What do you need?
Girl: _______________ to burn a CD?
Man: Sure. I know how to burn a CD.
Girl: _______________ make a CD of my favourite songs.
Man: Ok. No problrm.
Girl: I can do that, it's easy.
Man: You don’t have to pay me. It’s my pleasure.
Girl: Thanks. ____________________.
Man: Where are the CDs you want to copy?
Girl: Here they are, and here are the songs I want copy, and here is a blank CD
Man: Great, that’s all I need.
Girl: Thanks. End of dialogue one….

**Dialogue 2: A flat tire**
Girl: ____________________? 
Man: Yes, What’s the matter?
Girl: My scooter has a flat tire.
Man: Is it a flat tire or did you puncture it?
Girl: I'm not sure. I think it has a puncture.
Man: ____________________ help me puncture it?
Girl: That would be nice. I have never changed a flat tire before.
Man: Well, I’ll show you how to do it.
Girl: Thanks.
Man: and if it ever happens again, you can do it yourself.
Girl: Thanks so much. You’re very kind.
Man: It’s my pleasure.
Girl: Do you have a spare tire?
Man: I don’t have one.
Girl: oh, sorry I can’t help you then!
Girl: (what??)End of dialogue 2….

Task 2:
**Complete the dialogue using a word or a phrase:**
**Dialogue 3: Requesting a song**
Person A: Hello, WKRD Radio
Person B: Hi, ____________________.
Person A: What song you would like to request?
Person B: ____________________ request Hotel California by the Eagles.
Person A: All right. That’s a great song.
Person B: Who do you like to request it for?
Person A: It’s for Shawna, from Paul. This is our song. I love you baby.
Person B: Thanks Paul. I love you, too.
Person A: I don’t love you. I love Shawna.
Person B: No, I don’t love you. I love Shawna.
Person A: Thanks a lot Mr. D.J. SONG..... End of dialogue three..

Week two (session 2)
Making A Request
Activities phase 2

I. In pairs, discuss:
Answer the following questions:

1. What is the purpose of the girl in the first dialogue?
2. How did the girl grab the man’s attention in the beginning of the conversation?
3. How did the girl bring the man to show pre-commitment? How did she prepare him to her request?
4. Why did she ask the man whether he knows how to burn a CD?
5. Did she use a direct or an indirect request? [Explicit versus hedged]
6. Underline the head act of the request.
7. What kind of strategies did she use to support her request?
8. Were these strategies part of the alerter, head act, or the supporting moves before or after the head act?
9. What do you think will the man help the girl?

Dialogue 1: Burning a CD
Girl: hey! Can you help me?
Man: Sure. What do you need?
Girl: Do you know how to burn a CD?
Man: Sure. I know how to burn a CD.
Girl: I want to make a CD of my favourite songs.
Man: Ok. No problem. I can do that, it’s easy.
Girl: Thanks. I’ll pay you.
Man: You don’t have to pay me. It’s my pleasure.
Girl: Thanks.

Is there anything I can do to help?
Man: Where are the CDs you want to copy?
Girl: Here they are, and here are the songs I want copy, and here is a blank CD
Man: Great, that’s all I need.
Girl: Thanks. End of dialogue one..

II. In pairs, discuss:
Answer the following questions:

1. What is the purpose of the girl in the second dialogue?
2. How did the girl grab the man’s attention in the beginning of the conversation?
3. How did the girl bring the man to show pre-commitment? How did she prepare him to her request?
4. Did she use direct or indirect request strategies? [Explicit versus hinting]
5. Underline the head act of the request.
6. What kind of strategies did she use to support her request?
7. Were these strategies part of the alerter, head act, or the supporting moves before or after the head act?
8. What do you think will the man help the girl?

**Dialogue 2: A flat tire**
Girl: Excuse me. Can you give me a hand?
Man: Yes, What’s the matter?
Girl: My scooter has a flat tire.
Man: Is it a flat tire or did you puncture it?
Girl: I’m not sure. I think it has a puncture.
Man: **Would you like me to** help me puncture it?
Girl: That would be nice. **I have never changed a flat tire before.**
Man: Well, I’ll show you how to do it.
Girl: Thanks.
Man: and if it ever happens again, you can do it yourself.
Girl: Thanks so much. You’re very kind.
Man: It’s my pleasure.
    Do you have a spare tire?
Girl: I don’t have one.
Man: oh, sorry I can’t help you then!
Girl: (what??)End of dialogue 2....

**III. In pairs, discuss:**
**Answer the following questions:**
1. What is the purpose of person A in the third dialogue?
2. How did the person A grab the person B’s attention in the beginning of the conversation?
3. How did the person A bring person B to show pre-commitment? How did he prepare him to her request?
4. Did person A use direct or indirect request strategies? [Explicit versus hinting]
5. Underline the head act of the request.
6. What kind of strategies did person A use to support his request?
7. Were these strategies part of the alerter, head act, or the supporting moves before or after the head act?
8. What do you think will person B help person A?

**Dialogue 3: Requesting a song**
Person A: Hello, WKRD Radio
Person B: **Hi, I would like to request a song.**
Person A: What song you would like to request?
Person B: **I would like to request** Hotel California by the Eagles.
Person A: All right. That’s a great song.
Person B: Who do you like to request it for?
Person A: It’s for Shawna, from Paul. This is our song. I love you baby.
Person B: Thanks Paul. I love you, too.
Person A: I don’t love you. I love Shawna.
Person B: No, I don’t love you. I love Shawna.
Person A: Thanks a lot Mr. D.J.
SONG.....· End of dialogue three...

Name:                                                        Student Number:

Practice:
In pairs, role play with your partner the following situations:

1. Since you have got an appointment with your doctor, you want your sister to take care of your son for an hour.

2. Your score in 'Listening and Speaking' is not what you are expecting. Therefore, you ask your teacher to examine your paper again.

Your Request:
Appendix F: Participant Information Sheet

Project reference number:
Title of Project: The Role Of Pragmatics Instruction In Language Learning In The Context Of English As A Foreign Language

This research project contributes to the field of foreign language learning and education I am undertaking at the Cardiff Metropolitan University.

The focus of my research was stimulated my personal experiences of teaching and learning English as a foreign language and discussions with academic staff who engage in the same field. I want to find out the role of instruction in pragmatic aspects on foreign language learning and teaching in the context of foreign language. I would like to explore the learners’ attitudes towards their learning the functional features of the language as well.

- This is an invitation to you to join the study, and to let you know what this would involve. The study is being organised by Reham El Shazly in the College of Language and Communication (CLC) at Arab Academy for Science, Technology and Maritime Transport, (AASTMT) and Cardiff School of Education, having the researcher affiliated to both institutions.

- The findings of the research will be reported in an anonymised form and distributed internally to a range of stakeholders. I also intend to publish the results of the study in a prominent academic journal.

- This research project is sponsored by the Arab Academy for Science, Technology and Maritime Transport, AASTMT.

- If you want to find out more about the research project, or if you need more information to help you make a decision about joining in, please contact me on Reham El Shazly on my cellular phone (202) (01125088887) and via email: remoo@aucegypt.edu. You can also visit my office in building B, room (006).
Your Participation in the Research Project

Why you have been asked

I am approaching all members of undergraduate students in term one of Humanities Department in the CLC within the Arab Academy for Science, Technology and Maritime Transport, AASTMT to take part in this study. Taking part is entirely voluntary – there is no obligation to join the study.

What happens if you want to change your mind?

If you decide to join the study you can change your mind and stop at any time. I will respect your decision. If you wish to withdraw from the study, please could you let me know either by email or by telephone. There are no penalties for stopping.

What would happen if you join the study?

If you agree to join the study, then initially, you will be asked to complete the anonymous paper-and-pencil questionnaire that will ask you about your experiences related to English language learning and training. I anticipate that this will take approximately 15 minutes to complete and submit to me in person. If you are willing to participate, you will be filling out two questionnaires as pre-tests. These questionnaires should take you approximately 60 minutes. Here, you would be given a recognition DCT questionnaire, containing a set of briefly described situations ten situations and three possible rejoinders to which you have to choose one based on your judgments on the pragmatic appropriateness of requests used. You should also be given a production DCT, containing a set of briefly described situations, ten situations, to which you have to provide an appropriate rejoinder producing requests. The situational description in both DCTs is given in English. It is based on the family, social and academic lives of people in a western culture, as an English-speaking culture. The situations are student-life oriented in order to reflect western students' real life experience and to ensure naturalness of data as much as possible. The situations represent variable social power, social distance and size of imposition between speakers. The whole study should take around twelve weeks.
Are there any risks?
I do not think there are any significant risks due to the study. I have piloted this study with a small group of students, and they suggested that everything is very straightforward, and not stressful. If you did feel that there was any stress involved, you can ask to stop at any time.

It is important for you to note that the focus of the questioning contributes to the PhD that I am undertaking. Whilst the final outcomes may inform future practice within the AASTMT and Cardiff School of Education, the information you provide as a participant will be treated anonymously.

Your rights.
You may withdraw from the study at any time without penalties.

What happens to the questionnaires, the logs and the results of the study?
As the researcher, I will be responsible for putting all the information from the study (except names and addresses, and personal identification information) into a computer programme. I will then look to see the role of instruction in pragmatic aspects and the participants’ recognition and performance in pragmatic competence. Once the data has been analysed and written up, the results will be made public with the final submission of the thesis.

Are there any benefits from taking part?
There are some direct benefits to you for taking part in this study; actually, it may help improve your ability to use the language in a culturally appropriate manner. Receiving the treatment would in fact enable you to make some informed decisions on the pragmatic features of the language. It would raise your awareness of L2 pragmatic structures in order to help you with their pragmatic competence. When the study is complete and the results have been published I will let you know what I have found.
How your privacy will be protected:
All the information you provide will be strictly confidential and your privacy will be respected. I will be taking careful steps to make sure that you cannot be identified from any of the data provided or any confidential information about you that is collated/held as part of the study.

I will keep your name and personal details completely separate from the information you provide voluntarily for the study. Data will be coded so that you will not be identifiable.

When I have finished the study and analysed the information, all the forms used to gather data will be completely destroyed. I will retain a copy of the attached consent form for 10 years, because we are required to do so by the University.

Please note: Informed consent is incorporated into the research questionnaire.

Contact Details: Reham El Shazly – email: remoo@aucegypt.edu- office: Building C (403)
Appendix G: Consent Form

CONSENT FORM

By signing this consent form, you are not waiving your legal rights or releasing the investigator(s) or involved institution(s) from their legal and professional responsibilities.

I have read the information presented in the information letter about a study being conducted by Reham El Shazly of the College of Language and Communication at Arab Academy for Science, Technology and Maritime Transport. I have had the opportunity to ask any questions related to this study, to receive satisfactory answers to my questions, and any additional details I wanted.

I am aware that I have the option of allowing my questionnaires and the logs of my self-reported diaries to be used for the purposes of this research.
I am also aware that excerpts from these diaries may be included in the thesis and/or publications to come from this research, with the understanding that the quotations will be anonymous.

I was informed that I may withdraw my consent at any time without penalty by advising the researcher.

This project has been reviewed by, and received ethics clearance through, the Research Ethics Committee at UWIC.

With full knowledge, I agree to participate in this study.

☐ YES ☐ NO

I agree to have my questionnaires and diaries analysed and studied.

☐ YES ☐ NO

I agree to the use of anonymous quotations in any thesis or publication that comes of this research.

☐ YES ☐ NO

Participant Name: ____________________________ (Please print)

Participant Signature: ____________________________

Witness Name: ____________________________ (Please print)

Witness Signature: ____________________________

Date: ____________________________
Appendix H: Socio-economic Background Questionnaire

Socio-economic background questionnaire: Adapted from Byon (2005)

1. English course/ programme you are currently taking or enrolled in: ..................................................

2. Gender: Male Female

3. Class level: Freshman Junior graduate

4. Where were you born: (country) ..............................................................

5. Your native language: ..........................................................
    Other(s): ........................................................................

6. Do you ever use English with friends or family members: YES NO

7. Mention or circle the frequency: ..............................................
   a) Always 90% or more
   b) Often 70%- 80%
   c) Sometimes 50 % or less
   d) Never 15% or less

8. Mention or circle the persons you use English with: ............................... ..........................
   a) Grandmother/father
   b) Mother/father
   c) Sister/brother/siblings
   d) Relatives
   e) Friends
   f) Others (mention who): ........................................................................

9. Have you ever visited America/England/ Australia? YES NO
    Any other English speaking country (Mention the name) ..................................................

10. If yes how many times? ............................................................
    How long? .................. years........ Months....... Days.......
### Appendix I: Frequency Counts

Table 8: Frequency of Correct/Incorrect Judgments of Appropriateness in Pre- and Post-Intervention MDCTs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Freq. of correct Jdg. Pre-</th>
<th>Freq. of incorrect Jdg. Pre-</th>
<th>Freq. of correct Jdg. Post-</th>
<th>Freq. of incorrect Jdg. Post-</th>
<th>% of variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEAX</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10% ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YLAX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSAX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSAX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMAX</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHAX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSAX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEAX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYAX</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTAX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHAX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSHAX</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTAX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASAX</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBAX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNAX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZHAX</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFAX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAAX</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESAX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKAX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHAX</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHAX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YGAX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40% ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHAX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHAX</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWAX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFAX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAX</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWAX</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20% ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>327</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↑increase  ↓decrease  = stability  N=45
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Appendix J: Participants' Authentic Scripts

Participant FYAX Authentic Scripts WDCT:

Production DCT
Eight situations are described below. Please read the situations down what you would say in that situation. Say as much as you can in the situation. There is no right or wrong answer, and sometimes more than one answer is appropriate. It is important that you understand the situation fully. If there is something you do not understand, ask the teacher, he/she will explain it to you.

Situation 1
You are studying at home. Your younger brother opens the window and the cold wind blows into your face and bothers you. You want to ask him to close it. What would you say?
You:
I’m studying and I’m bothered from the wind. please close the window.

Grounded external
Interrogative internal / Syntactic
Punctuation / lexical

Situation 2
In the study center, you are working with your classmates preparing a group presentation. You are deciding who will take responsibility for which part of the presentation. Your friend is very good with computers. You want to ask him to design the PowerPoint slides. What would you ask?
You:
You’re very good with computers, do you mind designing the PowerPoint slides? I’m sure you’ll do something good.

Prepositional / lexical / syntactic
Consultative internal / lexical down
Intensifier internal / lexical upgrade
Subjectivity (internal / lexical downgrade)
Situation 3

At the tutor’s office, you have just received an essay back and want to discuss it with your tutor. She is very busy. You go to your tutor’s office after the class. You want to make an appointment with her as soon as possible. What would you ask?

You:

Good morning, I can see you’re busy but I wanted to discuss some points in my essay. When can I come talk to you about it?

Situation 4

You really have to take this course in order to graduate, but you found that the course is already closed. So, you decide to ask the professor, whom you don’t know, to allow you to take this course. What would you say to get this professor to permit you to participate in this course?

You:

Good afternoon, you know how important this course is and I wouldn’t graduate without it. So please can you allow me to take this course?

Situation 5

On campus, you have a lecture in Engineering Building but don’t know where the building is. Stop another student (who you don’t know) on campus. You want directions to the building. What would you ask?

You:

Hi, sorry to take from your time, but just wanted to ask for the directions for the engineering building.

Apologetic exterior

Dis appoint (to take from your time) Exterior cost minimizer (just) Exterior
Situation 6
Your class has just finished and you need a lift home. Your fellow classmate who was supposed to give you a lift is absent. As you come out of the class, you see another classmate who lives in the same area of yours. You decide to ask him for a lift home. What would you say?
You:

Sorry but my friend who was supposed to take me home didn’t come today, would it be a problem if you gave me a lift home?

Apology External
Grounder External
Past / Internal
Syntactical Past / que

Interest
Condit.

Situation 7
Your friend and you go to a restaurant to eat. You want to order and need to ask the waiter for the menu. What would you say?
You:

Excuse me, could I have a menu please?

Alerter External
Interest
Internal / Syntactic
Past / Internal / Syntactic
Politeness marker
Internal lexical

Situation 8
You are the president of a university. Something is wrong with your computer. You have to finish some work that is due tomorrow. One of the students is very skillful in fixing computers. You know him. However, you want to ask him to fix your computer. What would you say?
You:

I have a problem with my computer and it urgently because I have some work due tomorrow. If you have time can you please fix it?

Preparator
Grounder
Condition
Interest
Politeness
Production DCT

Eight situations are described below. Please read the situation down what you would say in that situation. Say as much as you can.

There is no right or wrong answer, and sometimes more than one answer is appropriate. It is important that you understand the situation fully. If there is something you do not understand, ask the teacher, he/she will explain it to you.

Situation 1
You are studying at home. Your younger brother opens the window and the cold wind blows into your face and bothers you. You want to ask him to close it. What would you say?

You: I'm studying because I have a test, so please close the window.

Situation 2
In the study center, you are working with your classmates preparing a group presentation. You need to decide who will take responsibility for which part of the presentation. Your friend is very good at using computers. You want to ask him to design the PowerPoint slides. What would you ask?

You: I know you are good with computers, do you want to be responsible for the design of the slides?
**Situation 3**

At the tutor's office, you have just received an essay back and want to discuss it with your tutor. She is very busy. You go to your tutor's office after the class. You want to make an appointment to see her as soon as possible. What would you ask?

You:

> Excuse me, I know you are busy right now, but I wanted to discuss my essay with you at what time so can I make an appointment to see you and discuss it with you please?

**Situation 4**

You really have to take this course in order to graduate, but you found that the course is already closed. So, you decide to ask the professor, whom you don’t know, to allow you to take this course. What would you say to get this professor to permit you to participate in this course?

You:

> Good morning. I tried to sign up for the course but it was already closed and as you know this course is very important since it will make me graduate. So can you please allow me to take this course?

**Situation 5**

On campus, you have a lecture in Engineering Building but don’t know where the building is. You stop another student (who you don’t know) on campus. You want directions to the building. What would you ask?

You:

> Sorry for interrupting but I was just wondering how to ask for the engineering building.
Situation 6
Your class has just finished and you need a lift home. Your fellow classmate who was supposed to give you a lift is absent. As you come out of the class, you see another classmate who lives in the same area of yours. You decide to ask him for a lift home. What would you say?
You: question to prepare
Are going home after class? (If yes, can you please give me a lift home?)
(preparatory, politeness, checking availability)

Situation 7
Your friend and you go to a restaurant to eat. You want to order and need to ask the waiter for the menu. What would you say?
You:
Excuse me, may I have the menu please?
(preparatory, politeness, main)

Situation 8
You are the president of a university. Something is wrong with your computer. You have to finish some work that is due tomorrow. One of the students is very skillful in fixing computers. You do not know him. However, you want to ask him to fix your computer. What would you say?
You: preparatory - sweetness, preparatory
Hi, I heard that you are very skillful in fixing computers. If you have time, can you help me fix my computer because I need it urgently?
(preparatory, sweetness, main)
Research Methodology
Appendix B
Production WDCT
Eight situations are described. Write down what you would do in each situation and explain why you did it. There is no right or wrong answer, and sometimes more than one answer is appropriate. It is important that you understand the situation fully. If there is something you do not understand, ask the teacher, he/she will explain it to you.

Situation 1
You are studying at home. Your younger brother opens the window and the cold wind blows right into your face and bothers you. You want to ask him to close it. What would you say?
You:
Would you please close the window?
Interrogative
Politeness markers

Situation 2
In the study center, you are working with your classmates preparing a group presentation. You are deciding who will take responsibility for which part of the presentation. Your friend is very good with computers. You want to ask him to design the PowerPoint slides. What would you ask him?
You:
Can you design the PowerPoint slides?
Interrogative

Situation 3
At the tutor’s office, you have just received an essay back and want to discuss it with your tutor. She is very busy. You go to your tutor’s office after the class. You want to make an appointment to see her as soon as possible. What would you ask?
You:
Sorry, I tried to discuss the essay with you, but I know you’re busy. When I could see you again?
Appointment request

Situation 4
You really have to take this course in order to graduate, but you found that the course is already closed. So, you decide to ask the professor, whom you don’t know, to allow you to take this course. What would you say to get this professor to permit you to participate in this course?
Situation 5
On campus, you have a lecture in Engineering Building but don’t know where the building is.
You stop another student (who you don’t know) on campus. You want directions to the building. What would you ask?
You: Sorry, what is the direction of E to the Engineering Building?

Situation 6
Your class has just finished and you need a lift home. Your fellow classmate who was supposed to give you a lift is absent. As you come out of the class, you see another classmate who lives in the same area as yours. You decide to ask him for a lift home. What would you say?
You: Could you please lift me home?

Situation 7
Your friend and you go to a restaurant to eat. You want to order and need to ask the waiter for the menu. What would you say?
You: Could you bring the menu?

Situation 8
You are the president of a university. Something is wrong with your computer. You have to finish some work that is due tomorrow. One of the students is very skillful in fixing computers. You don’t know him. However, you want to ask him to fix your computer. What would you say?
You: Excuse me, could you help me?
Participant YGAX Authentic Scripts Post-Intervention WDCT:

Production DCT

Eight situations are described below. Please write down what you would say in that situation.

There is no right or wrong answer, and sometimes more than one answer is appropriate. It is important that you understand the situation fully. If there is something you do not understand, ask the teacher; he/she will explain it to you.

Situation 1

You are studying at home. Your younger brother opens the window and the cold wind blows into your face and bothers you. You want to ask him to close it. What would you say?

You:

Please, close the door. +P

Politeness marker Imperative -SD

+1 Internal + Imperative (direct)

Situation 2

In the study center, you are working with your classmates preparing a group presentation. You are deciding who will take responsibility for which part of the presentation. Your friend is very good with computers. You want to ask him to design the PowerPoint slides. What would you ask him?

You:

Could you design the PowerPoint slides?

Past tense Imperative Internal

Internal
Situation 3

At the tutor's office, you have just received an essay back and want to discuss it with your tutor. The tutor is very busy. You go to your tutor's office after the class. You want to make an appointment to see her as soon as possible. What would you ask?

You:

Past tense, conditional

Doctor, I was wondering if I can make an appointment to see you as soon as possible. I want to discuss the essay with you.

Situation 4

You really have to take this course in order to graduate, but you found that the course is already closed. So, you decide to ask the professor, whom you don’t know, to allow you to take this course.

What would you say to get this professor to permit you to participate in this course?

You:

Past tense, conditional

I was wondering if I could talk to you. I want to take this course but it is already closed. So I want you to permit me to participate this course.

Situation 5

On campus, you have a lecture in Engineering Building but don't know where the building is. You stop another student (who you don’t know) on campus. You want directions to the building. What would you ask?

You:

Excuse me, could you please help me. I don’t know where is the Engineering Building.
Situation 6
Your class has just finished and you need a lift home. Your fellow classmate who was supposed to give you a lift is absent. As you come out of the class, you see another classmate who lives in the same area of yours. You decide to ask him for a lift home. What would you say?
You: Hi, could you lift me home, my friend is absent.

Situation 7
Your friend and you go to a restaurant to eat. You want to order and need to ask the waiter for the menu. What would you say?
You: Excuse me, could you bring the menu?

Situation 8
You are the president of a university. Something is wrong with your computer. You have to finish some work that is due tomorrow. One of the students is very skillful in fixing computers. You don’t know him. However, you want to ask him to fix your computer. What would you say?
You: Could you do me a favor and fix my computer?
Appendix K: Teacher-researcher’s Sample of Field Notes

**Week 2 (Reflective Log)**

The lesson contained all four aspects of a lesson: warm-up, presentation, practice and evaluation. The students were really enthusiastic about the intervention because the pragmatic knowledge they were introduced was new aspect to their language learning. It also seemed completely different from what they would do or say in their L1. It is as if they were introduced into the golden rules of the TL.

The whole session went on smoothly, and the learners enjoyed since they actively participated in all activities, no one was left out. The learners’ attention was drawn to the pragmatic features of the TL where the form and the usage of the TL were illustrated. They gained insights into the TL conventions and behaviours. Faulty perceptions about the TL routines were corrected and the correct ones were enhanced. They seemed actively engaged in the performance activity; however, some of them were intimidated to act scenarios in public. Some of them were disposed to be silent (reticence), which seemed alarming to me for the coming classes.

With reference to the warm-up phase, when the participants received their first set of tasks, I asked each pair of students to discuss the answers together before giving their answers. I made sure that collaborative learning was enhanced by grouping the learners into small groups, where the weak performers were paired up with the more advanced ones to scaffold them.

The questions that were used in this activity were well-constructed since they contained questions comparing the learners’ L1-L2 and elicited answers contained insights about faulty analogies between L1-L2. I helped the learners in the difficult answers by providing them with clues to avoid giving them the answers, typical to a learner-centred classroom.
The class began in tune and all students seemed very well-motivated. The session was opened with the warm-up which went on fine. Students answered the warm-up questions after watching the videos. The conscious-raising phase went on fine too. The new modification in the intervention seem to work perfectly well. It was introduced in the second cycle of the intervention (wk 5). They students welcomed this change, because most of them feared public performance. Therefore, they were very happy about their performance in groups. They even exchanged roles so each pair role-played their scenario and then they took their partner's scenario too. They appeared to be more comfortable in this new alteration (interactive pattern) where less risk was secured.
Appendix L: One Example of a Participant's Completed Diaries (Authentic Script)

Diary Number one
I would like to mention that i am strongly enjoying the listening and the speaking course the most, it became my favorite one of all, in my opinion it is the only suitable way to create an ideal character in order to be successful in the english language, which i personally admire.
To begin with, this study innovates a new internal perspective, it encourages the youth in my age to start improving, using and practicing more of the english language and being keen to move a step forward and to feel important in this universe. This is a huge privilege that i've been provided this course as a beginning, i believe that this idea helps in being more involved and confident in the surrounding events or whatever which is a great aspect that leads to a bright future as i see. One of the elements i appreciate during the session is the materials and the examples given while learning, which supports the curriculum and embeds the information properly, videos and audios help me memorize the lessons much faster and adds a special taste to the lecture that you never get bored, i believe that feeling excited and enjoying the subject is one of the enormous factors for improving yourself. To conclude with, am thankful to have such tutor in such course and the highlight of the elements for this course is you Dr. Reham because you really make me feel motivated and eager to come up with the best potential inside me, hope this is fitting on point.

Diary Number two
First, English is the most practical, understandable, reciprocal among the people all over the world, which facilitates the communication between the person and any other foreigner, in addition you could also make new friendship with people who speak English as you can start up conversations as long as you are interacting through the english language. Second, it is really good to learn many languages, this has an aspect on the person's character as it develops the self confidence and it entirely bans the idea of being shy or inclosed, so this would absolutely help with the person's productivity and the presence because of learning foreign languages and getting to know the English culture, no body would lose anything, you are always a winner if you are learning a little new thing every single day. In the end, I am really enjoying discussing such topics, moreover thank you so much dr.

Diary Number three
I am writing back in order to answer the first question. First of all, learning pragmatics has been very useful, as it facilitates learning English, not only this, but also helps to understand the Native speakers of the language more easily. Second, pragmatics also help improving the accent, In addition, avoiding the grammatical mistakes and being more exposed to the others’ culture from their language and their style. Third, It gives me self confidence as i feel more fluent in English; so i am more able to use it without fearing any mistakes. I know we are almost done with the course, however, it was really the most beneficial course and I am glad to have such Doctor like you.

Diary Number four
This diary is about which part of material have helped me to be confident. To be honest, this course i the most beneficial one i have taken for this semester. First, it has been a great experience to gain such influential benefit not only academically, but also in real life situations, especially when communicating with native speakers. For instance, applying real conversations with other students in order to use the language practically not just writing it, which helps training and improving the grammar, the pronunciation and the accent! This part was concerning the speaking sessions. Second, the listening tests and the listening exercises that we have done throughout the semester, helped me much in understanding the native speakers while talking, in addition, avoiding missing any part of the conversation while hearing some foreigner talking even if the speech is either fast or quick. At the end, Thank you doctor for being helpful during the sessions, moreover, teaching me something to be used so far. I know I should have discussed just one example but I had to say it all. Another thank you for your care.
Appendix M: Participants Diaries

Diary number 1

Table 1: Diary number 1 (Extract 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBAX</td>
<td>“this study innovates a new internal perspective, it encourages the youth in my age to start improving, using and practicing more of the english language and being keen to move a step forward ... This is a huge privilege that i've been provided this course as a beginning, i believe that this idea helps in being more involved and confident”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAX</td>
<td>“I found it interesting and eye opening”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBAX</td>
<td>“i would like to say that the classes are more enjoyable and productive than other english courses”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Diary number 1 (Extract 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learners</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEAX</td>
<td>“I think the classroom learning is very helpful and improved our language…but I have a big problem with English, because my old school”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHAX</td>
<td>“native Egyptian or fluent Arabic speakers made fun of me and patronized me when I tried to speak… made me feel isolated and even feel angry towards the language at certain points... in the present day, I still feel uncomfortable sometimes. However, I have noticed that when I'm out having fun with my friends, there will be a certain times where I feel very comfortable responding to questions in Arabic and sometimes even questions and sentences. I used to be EXTREMELY shy speaking Arabic ”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(EHAX is the native speaker of English relating her experiences of learning to speak Arabic)

Table 3: Diary number 1 (Extract 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learners</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HRAX</td>
<td>“I'm a little crazy about the english novels...I wish I can improve my English”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSAX</td>
<td>“I have always love the English language”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZHAX</td>
<td>“I personally enjoy listening and meeting people who speak English”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Diary number 1 (Extract 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learners</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EHAX</td>
<td>“[I] feel angry towards the language at certain points”;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAAX</td>
<td>i never feel comfortable with talking english all the time”;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHAX</td>
<td>&quot;whoever learn a foreign language can be safe from their [its NSs] cunning&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Diary number 1 (Extract 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learners</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSHAX</td>
<td>“ we use is listening to actual conversations in the proper foreign English not just any mimicked English”;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAX</td>
<td>“The realistic examples we take in class are very helpful because they explain and shows us how people interact with each other...There are certain factors that should be put into consideration while addressing individuals, such as tone, age, culture difference, and educational background”;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6: Diary number 1 (Extract 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learners</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBAX</td>
<td>“One of the elements I appreciate during the session is the materials and the examples given while learning, which supports the curriculum and embeds the information properly, videos and audios help me memorize the lessons much faster and adds a special taste to the lecture that you never get bored, i believe that feeling excited and enjoying the subject is one of the enormous factors for improving yourself”;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMAX</td>
<td>“it’s very helpful and interesting at the same time, it taught me what is the meaning of the social distance between people and if they have power over each other or not. It also taught me how to interact with foreigners”;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAX</td>
<td>“the words highlighted in bold were very useful and it was a smart thing”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7: Diary number 1 (Extract 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learners</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSAX</td>
<td>“I loved the classes and how we did things and this way we will always look forward for the class and it Including every time a new thing will make the class more creative and more achievable”;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTAX</td>
<td>“learning materials are useful as we learn how to understand and speak english by listening to english conversations in videos and also talking in english with the teacher and interacting with colleagues which encourages us to interact with strange people later on”;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8: Diary number 1 (Extract 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NBAX</td>
<td>“i think it would be better to try and lower the level of the materials that are being taught as to give them a chance to understand or get better, with that being said i also would not want it to be too easy for the rest of us. In conclusion if the courses’ level was lowered to an average for only two sessions or so, more people would benefit and there may be significant improvement for some”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9: Diary number 1 (Extract 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FHAX</td>
<td>“the most thing that I really love and respect about our course work is the friendly spirit…we are given the whole freedom to express ourselves without being evaluated just by grades, we discuss and talk freely without being tensioned or scared to say or answer something even if it’s wrong”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBAX</td>
<td>“you really make me feel motivated and eager to come up with the best potential inside me”;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 10: Diary number 2 (Extract 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTAX</td>
<td>&quot;Learning foreign language like English is something so important for people. First, I like learning English as a language. Second, as one who likes travelling a lot, I will be in contact with foreigners. Third, learning languages facilitate finding new jobs. Fourth, I want to learn English as I have a target to teach illiterate people. At last, in future English makes me help my children with their studies...it helps me to know new cultures and reading new books.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| NAAAX   | "it helps people to communicate with each other from different countries. English language provides the medium for all culture to communicate through movies or books and we all suppose to learn English...All the companies now wants fluently speakers...It used by the most famous writers in Britain and America like Shakespeare...with the help of this language we can aware for new adventures and technologies."
| FHAX    | "I would like to learn english because it is the world language, it is the most popular and the most spreaded and common language between all the countries. I would like to know more about the foreign culture and thoughts, how they do think and behave, their traditions and how to correctly communicate with them without being misunderstood because they are very different from our arab culture. I would like to learn english well to master the language, and being able to write and talk fluently." |
| HRAX    | "I think I like to learn it because it's the world language, it is the most popular and the most spreaded and common language between all the countries. I would like to know more about the foreign culture and thoughts, how they do think and behave, their traditions and how to correctly communicate with them without being misunderstood because they are very different from our arab culture. I would like to learn english well to master the language, and being able to write and talk fluently." |

### Table 11: Diary number 2 (Extract 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABAX</td>
<td>&quot;I enjoy meeting and listening people who speak English to communicate with other cultures and to deal with all kind of people...I dislike meeting and listening people who speak English to avoid embarrassment if I am not aware enough with the other cultures and also to avoid grammar mistakes.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SMAX    | "but i have some problems makes me afraid when using me language and i need to learn more and speak English well as is it my mother language because of many reasons...despite of in few times I don't understand everything"
| NHAX    | "Well let me begin with how amazing speaking English is. Talking in English is such way to feel that you can communicate with other people from different countries. So you can say that I like to speak in English with foreign people and some local people, but in class really i hate to speak in English that bothering me specially when you see the 'kids' in this class.."
| EHAX    | "I hope to learn Arabic because nearly all of my friends and even family speak Arabic and the fact that I cannot speak fluently yet makes me feel more distant from them..."

### Table 12: Diary number 2 (Extract 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAAX</td>
<td>&quot;I think that it easy to learn and to speak and to write...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTAX</td>
<td>&quot;English is an easy language anyone can learn it..&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLAX</td>
<td>&quot;There are more than 50 countries talk english because it is easy and simple language..&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZHAX</td>
<td>&quot;English is based on a simple alphabet and it is fairly quick and easy to learn compared to other languages.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 13: Diary number 2 (Extract 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HHAX</td>
<td>“There are many reasons to learn English, because it's from the one of the most difficult languages to learn...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKAX</td>
<td>“Learning any language it is not easy, but with practice the language, we can be good at it...I am not really good at English. At the beginning, I found it so hardly for me to understand all the lessons in English, but I think it will be easy when I accustomed it day-by-day, week by week”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 14: Diary number 2 (Extract 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FMAX</td>
<td>“I do enjoy speaking in English, I reached the point that sometimes I cant express my feelings or thoughts right in Arabic any more. I prefer English over Arabic from my point of view.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMAX</td>
<td>“I actually like listening and speaking in English, i kind of think it is more gentle and that english is more better than arabic in some words..I like when i am with my friends and we start talking in english and also in school and meetings when we talk in english that makes me more comfortable.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHAX</td>
<td>“I really enjoy listening to my friends and acquaintances speaking Arabic because most of the time they have on a smile and are joking around, hearing Arabic spoken every day improves my ability to learn it. I enjoy speaking Arabic because I feel there are expressions in this language that communicate a message better than in English. For example; the expression &quot;Haram Aleik&quot; communicates displeasure or discomfort with someone's actions or words but in English, saying &quot;sin upon you&quot; sounds silly and over reactive.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAX</td>
<td>“I feel that the English language is the only way I can express my self with, I feel free, independent, strong and confident when I speak it. It helped me be who I am right now and it helped me to figure out my true identity. In my case English is not just a language it's a way of living. Also one of the reasons that learning English is so important is that it is the leading language in the world and the most effective one.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 15: Diary number 3 (Extract 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTAX</td>
<td>“Pragmatics improves the language for learners. Before, I was talking in the situations without thinking about the structure of the sentence, I was only thinking about the grammar's basics. In addition to, I wasn't focusing on the steps I should start a conversation with. For instance, &quot;Excuse me&quot; and &quot;Hello&quot; then asking the question. Furthermore, I wasn't taking care of the politeness way I should ask with like saying &quot;Please&quot;. Now, I'm thinking about the way I should ask with if it's direct or indirect. Moreover, I respect the social distance in the conversation.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTAX</td>
<td>“At the beginning of the semester, I didn’t know how to differ between making a formal and informal conversation, how to ask someone about anything with respecting the social distance, power, age and the size of the request i am asking for. In addition, i learnt when and how to use direct and indirect requests by using preparations before or after the request and hints. So it's not just to learn and speak the english language, it's about how to use it in the right way to be able to speak with native speakers.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHAX</td>
<td>“At the begining I was not able to differentiate between the formal way and informal way to ask about something or make request. I used can I? may I? I want to.. for both without knowing the difference of using each one in the right situation. Actually, I never thought about anything concerning a direct or indirect way to make a request neither the social distance nor power. At the beginning, I confess I said it is very easy why are we learning such a school lessons in college? But now I can say it is totally different!! I did not realise the importance and the real value of it till I knew that I was using it wrong and how useful it is. Now I learned many techniques and I am able to express myself easier!!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWAX</td>
<td>“In fact, he added a lot to me. At the begin, I though that most of respect in conversation is concentrated in few words &quot;please, thank you&quot;. Now i know a lot about technique of conversation. How can i do request gently by using many strategies. Really I'm so happy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YGAX</td>
<td>“At the beginning of the semester I didn’t know how to make the right conversation by starting with alerting and then I should make a hint before making the request and I know what is the grounding! Now I know how to make the right request in the right situation! And how to talk in polite way and how to talk in impolite way. Now I know that asking for a favor depends on the person who I talk to if he is older than me or in the same age, and if i know him well or not. At the beginning of the semester i was thinking that all the situations are the same and there is no difference between any situation. I am so happy”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 16: Diary number 3 (Extract 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBAX</td>
<td>“First of all, learning pragmatics has been very useful, as it facilitates learning English, not only this, but also helps to understand the Native speakers of the language more easily. Second, pragmatics also help improving the accent, In addition, avoiding the grammatical mistakes and being more exposed to the others' culture from their language and their style. Third, it gives me self confidence as i feel more fluent in English; so i am more able to use it without fearing any mistakes. I know we are almost done with the course, however, it was really the most beneficial course and i am glad to have such Doctor like you.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESAX</td>
<td>“Using English in any conversations, even if I am placed in a situation that require me to speak in English, was a nightmare for me. This situation has been completely changed in English lectures where I have been a participant in English conversations many times. This experience has been useful in many ways. First of all, this makes me acquire a numbers of new vocabularies to be able to speak. Second, this encourages me to get more knowledge about the English grammars to be able to arrange complete and correct sentence. Moreover, this helps to learn how to arrange sentences in the correct sequence to form a good, meaningful and understood conversation. This explains how the nightmare of English conversations have been changed into a good, useful and interesting experience.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 17: Diary number 3 (Extract 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFAX</td>
<td>“I had the opportunity to not only make mistakes and learn from them but to also learn from my peers' mistakes without having to embarrass myself. I think it is also very close to a real life situation, so when I am ready to use English outside the classroom, I won't be as shy or unsure of myself. Well, I realized that it is very useful in learning a new language and I will be giving it a go when I start learning a new language in the future. I feel that it doesn't only give me a good chance to learn but also for my fellow students the equal chance. When pragmatics is not used, I've noticed that speech and pronunciation are given little to no consideration. So using pragmatics is the whole package.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAX</td>
<td>“It is nice to learn new things. Learning about pragmatics was very amusing and nice thing to learn about... Learning about pragmatics was useful to me in many ways. The first thing was learning about types of strategies, such as, direct, indirect, and hinting. Every one of these were explained to me in details, which made it a lot easier for me. The second thing was learning how to use these strategies correctly and in a formal way without being impolite. It really made me a better person in starting a conversation in English, which actually was a problem I used to have.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAX</td>
<td>“In the beginning of the semester i did not know how to start conversation with anyone, but when we started to learn how to make a conversation with anyone i felt more confident. Because it makes us more formal and polite with people who we do not know well and more specific about what we want to say in every situation. Now i know the difference between any situation and what's the expressions that we are supposed to say.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRAX</td>
<td>“I feel like I can finally build a full conversation with the right purpose and with full self of confidence!! (like I can read &amp; speak in front of anyone &amp; everyone with less fear.After 7 weeks everything seems different with my English, less difficult &amp; less complicated.. I guess i'm on the starting point to learn the right English. But to be honest I still feel that I'm a stranger to this language..”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 18: Diary number 3 (Extract 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSHAX</td>
<td>“Learning pragmatics has been useful for me as a participant in English conversation in so many ways. To start it off I really enjoy watching acted out dialogues especially the ones we watch because some of them are hilarious... It also taught me methods of polite and impolite talking, ways of asking requests in the direct and indirect ways and mainly how to know social distance between people just by the way they talk to each other. On the other hand, the part that I don't enjoy very much is the acting part. Not that I don't enjoy the process it self I do actually I just don't enjoy doing it in front of my classroom because they're very judgmental (or maybe I just feel like they are). Besides I find it very uncomfortable WHEN EVERYONE JUST STARES, it makes me even more nervous and I start stuttering and I forget most of my words. Yet I find the listening course very useful for our speaking and listening skills especially in English.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 19: Diary number 3 (Extract 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHAX</td>
<td>&quot;In Arabic culture when we need money from somebody we almost asked (requesting) him directly, like: &quot;Give me money&quot;. But in English culture they usually trend to the indirect request or hinting, like &quot;Oh! I forgot my money, Could you lend me money, please?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHAX</td>
<td>&quot;My Arabic is slowly but steadily improving. It feels like every few weeks, I get 1 or 2% better. Maybe some day I'll be fluent! ..Although, I can't speak Arabic enough to participate in long conversations, I do agree that Arabic has acceptable pragmatics that would not be accepted in English. An example would be; in Arabic, it's perfectly acceptable and even laughed at, to interrupt someone in the middle of a story or conversation. In English, this is considered extremely rude and immediately gives a wrong impression about that person. Helping me understand these pragmatic differences prevents me from getting irritated with my Arab friends who do this. It's not meant to be rude, it's just their way of being comfortable with me. I actually was unaware of the term &quot;pragmatics&quot; and just classified them under &quot;good manners&quot; as a whole. This course, among other things, has made me more aware of the different pragmatics and has made me more tolerant of them&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTAX</td>
<td>&quot;It was a very good experience. I saw the difference between before and now. I knew the difference and the way between Egypt and America. I learned how to talk with direct and indirect way. And to respect the person who I talk to even he/she is my friend. I learned to say I would like to not I want to.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 20: Diary number 3 (Extract 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSAX</td>
<td>&quot;by practicing i can tell that my level in speaking has been improved, moreover, our teacher is talking english in class all the time, which makes the whole issue easier. of course i mean &quot;by practicing&quot; above by using videos and making pop conversations with my collegues.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFAX</td>
<td>&quot;I had the opportunity to not only make mistakes and learn from them but to also learn from my peers’ mistakes without having to embarrass myself. I think it is also very close to a real life situation, so when I am ready to use English outside the classroom, I wont be as shy or unsure of myself.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAX</td>
<td>&quot;I learned from this program or course how when i pass in any situation how to pass it by successful way i learned that asking someone something its not just a question its alot of things for example if iam asking in direct way or indirect in polite way or impolite way, alerting the person iam asking him that iam going to ask its a way of life not just a way of learning&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTAX</td>
<td>&quot;Pragmatics improves the language for learners. Before, I was talking in the situations without thinking about the structure of the sentence, I was only thinking about the grammar's basics. In addition to, I wasn't focusing on the steps I should start a conversation with. For instance, &quot;Excuse me&quot; and &quot;Hello&quot; then asking the question. Furthermore, I wasn't taking care of the politeness way I should ask with like saying &quot;Please&quot;. Now, I'm thinking about the way I should ask with if it's direct or indirect. Moreover, I respect the social distance in the conversation.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAX</td>
<td>&quot;Learning about pragmatics has been useful to me when having to deal with a conversation with someone in the sense that, now when I have a conversation with someone I look closely at the social parameter, power, and all these factors. I am now more aware of what type of expressions to use when talking with someone and what words to use. I learned that being polite in all situations is an important factor, and that each situation requires certain techniques. So using the right expressions is necessary when you are communicating with someone.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Diary number 4

### Table 21: Diary number 4 (Extract 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **FMAX** | "I think it did for sure help me to be more aware and not to think that every culture is the same. Fluent English isn't enough to think you are a good enough speaker and to think that you may fit in any culture, this is a huge mistake. Being fluent and having a lack of background about the culture you are dealing with is a **catastrophe**. So to be a fluent speaker truly you must deal with the differences in the worldwide cultures."
|
| **EHAX** | "This course actually provided me with knowledge about the specifics of my language and also the similarities and contrasts in Arabic. Last lecture when we discussed pragmatics, it was so interesting, I really enjoy learning about other cultures and speaking about my own. I always enjoyed the different scenarios Doctor Reham would hand out to us and have us imagine what we would say and do in that situation. Learning about pragmatics also made me feel more aware about how others view my culture and how to communicate with someone from another culture by understanding theirs."
|
| **ZHAX** | "of course this course helped me a lot to know how others can speak with a respectful way how to ask for a permission in a good way without being rude or disrespectful, this course gave me alot of information of how other cultures talk with each other and also how to differentiate from the way you talk with someone who is superior or has more power than you example your teacher your director and someone who is close to you who is your best friend, colleague. So all of these stuff you have to be careful while talking with anyone of these to change your attitude like to be more polite while speaking with your teacher and to be normal or to talk freely while speaking with your best friend because you know each other. Finally this course helped me alot with the way I speak with others and also I learned how foreign people talk together."
|
| **SFAX** | "Throughout the course, we were given comparisons between our culture and the native speaking culture. What is rude and what isn’t, what is acceptable and what isn’t. We were given situations in which we were supposed to deal with appropriately and I think that that was very beneficial. Now I know what to and what not to expect when speaking with natives. I think that the practical parts of the course are very helpful. You get to actually test out your knowledge with a friend who will correct you and give you advice on what to improve. Watching videos and discussing cultural differences has also really helped because I can then confidently say that I have a solid background information on what the natives expect from a day to day conversation. For example, watching the video of the girls ordering at a restaurant. Watching videos and discussing cultural differences has also really helped.."
<p>|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RNAX</td>
<td>“At the first from my point of view i want to say that the course gives me more confident in myself because it show me how to speak, how to interest and attract people who show me when i speak. This course makes me rehearse, you have to be more confident in yourself. It gives me experience in how to speak in English without having to be afraid of the error, And also teaches you how to correct the mistake without showing. So you should to try to speak more and more without shy to got more confidence.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMAX</td>
<td>“First of all, i would like to thank you doctor Reham for all the hard work and the effort you did with us this semester. And i think that this course provided me with culture awareness of the english speaking culture as it made me talk to people in a nice way..it gave me self confidence with my english and my speaking.. i learnt things i never knew like the alerters and the hinting, the social distance helped me a lot between my doctors and my friends.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERAX</td>
<td>“This course provided me with cultural awareness of the English speaking culture. it's amazing and very helpful. It gave me a lot of information about the English speaking culture. It helped me understand many different things concerning English. It's very helpful and great. Ex: Watching movies and listening to what the characters say and understanding their talk make me happy and give me the desire to talk with people in English. Listening to people speaking English and understanding what they say give me confidence and prepare me to talk with English speaking people fluently.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YLAX</td>
<td>“This module helped me a lot because speaking is a productive skill that needs more and more practice to obtain mastery and competence in the language... Also the strategies we’ve learned were very useful specially requesting techniques direct, indirect and hinting and also what comes before the head act altering, preparation, grounder then the request and showing appreciation. In-class Practicing helped me being more confident. Lastly and most importantly I really enjoyed each second of this module. It was challenging and interesting. We learn more when we are having fun!”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23: Diary number 4 (Extract 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAAX</td>
<td>&quot;In my opinion, the section of studying paragmatics is the most helpful one; it states the way you have to use with others, whatever they are native speakers or not...While being in the cafeteria infront of the pasta section, last sunday, an African girl who doesn't speak arabic asked me about the best made pasta here, so I started by introducing the name of the chef who worked in various parts in Egypt as a professional chief to let her trust what I was going to say and these words acted as a grounder (one of the things paragmatics include), then I told her that the best pasta here, in my opinion, is a pasta with a mix of brown and white sauce with slices of chicken and hotdog with different colours of pepper, and if she wanted it spicy, she had to choose the hot pepper instead of using chili powder and to be sure of what I said, she could wait a little till The chef ended my pasta to taste it and she agreed(I gave it as a hint to know what I want here to do). At the end, she was convinced by what I said and she thought it was a delicious one, then she got out twenty pounds to pay for a pasta.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWAX</td>
<td>&quot;i learned the technique of conversation, I know a lot about the ways of requesting and Things affecting the request like: power, distance...And for me i have known new Vocabulary and if I know one vocab, i won. I hope i learn more about English speaking. I want to mention my admiration to this project. i was shy to speak in English in front of people and This was an opportunity to solve it. i am really happy to learn how to make a presentation too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAX</td>
<td>&quot;At the beginning of the course I thought that it wouldn't be useful for me, fortunately it was really very useful and helpful. The course helped me in handling a conversation in English language. The course also provided me with cultural awareness of the English speaking culture for example, I knew that in their culture there are a lot of red lines that you are not allowed to skip. I also knew that there are some techniques in opening a conversation in English language and I can't use the ways that we use in our community. As a summary, the course was very useful and helpful to me and it taught me a lot of things about English speaking culture and I want to learn more.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24: Diary number 4 (Extract 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSHAX</td>
<td>&quot;...In contrary, it also has plenty of cons for example: not everyone is in the same level of speaking English; some are good and some have troubles. For those who aren't that good they would feel pretty embarrassed and humiliated by hearing peoples laughs, they would get so nervous that they would forget all their lines even if they knew them off by heart and they may try their best to imitate a good English accent but in the end they flop and turn out sounding funny which will let them down and make their hope slide down the hill, that they're no longer going to even want to try.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAAX</td>
<td>&quot;English conversation and listening provided me with great knowledge that helps me a lot while communicating in any conversation. Any conversation is first build upon grammar and how we put each verb on his right place by making sure of the tense. The second point is phonetics, how we really pronounce words and letters, the difference between the P and the B. When you say za or the and how it is very important. The right use of sentences that we shouldn't use too much ran on sentences while speaking. The culture of english is the grammar and the phonetics. While speaking we should take care from these two because without them the meaning will be disturbed and the english language will lose it culture&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESAX</td>
<td>&quot;How could an activity modify your skills is an amazing, magical experience that I have examined in this course with the listening activity through the lectures. First of all, the pronunciation in the correct way of different vocabulary. Moreover, it makes me learn how to arrange complete sentence in an organized matter. Also, how to carry out a well organized, meaningful conversation in the correct application of the speaking grammars. Finally, it helps me to gain account less number of new vocabulary by trying to understand the word to understand what I listen to.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>