

**The Impact of Explicit Instruction on Developing Pragmatic
Competence: a Focus on Refusal to Offers***

Dr. Basim Yehya Jasim
Assistant Professor
Dept. of English Language
University of Mosul

Bann Ahmed Hamuody
Assistant lecturer
Dept. of Librarianship
Mosul Technical Institute

ABSTRACT

Interlanguage pragmatic (ILP) literature has less contributed to the understanding of how L2 pragmatic competence (PC) is developed. Additionally, previous research interested in developing PC through pedagogical intervention has been confined to rather small sets of speech acts such as requests and apologies but has overlooked others such as refusals. Accordingly, in an attempt to see how ILP stage is developed, the present study tries to investigate whether pragmatic transfer (PT) exists in the ILP stage when the Iraqi foreign language learners make refusals in the American context prior to any instruction, whether explicit instruction has relative effects on developing these learners' refusal PC and whether incorporating an awareness raising (AR) perspective during the explicit instructional session makes them aware of the American refusal pragmalinguistic as well as the sociopragmatic aspects and more aware of the cross-cultural differences between both languages; i.e. Iraqi as the L1 and American as an FL so as to avoid any instance of pragmatic failure (PF). An eclectic communicatively

* This research is based upon an MA thesis entitled "**The Impact of Explicit Instruction on Developing the Pragmatic Competence of Advanced Iraqi Learners of English: a Focus on Refusals**", (2009) submitted by Bann Ahmed Hamuody and supervised by Dr. Basim Yehya Jasim.

oriented technique has been proposed to help delivering explicitly the L2 targeted speech act through activities involving description, explanation and practicing of the targeted feature in FL classroom setting. Forty-four Iraqi first-year college students studying in the department of English, College of Arts, University of Mosul were the subjects in the present study identically assigned to two groups: treatment and control groups. Three written Discourse Completion Tests (DCTs) were conducted . The findings obtained confirm that PT from Iraqi refusals did exist when the subjects made American refusals before any instruction. Explicit instruction did make effective development in the treatment subjects' PC to approach the L2 native-like, and conducting AR procedure during the explicit instructional sessions did accelerate L2 pragmatic development.

INTRODUCTION

Numerous literature in interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) has considered the need of L2 learners to use appropriate speech acts during interactions as a main component constructing their L2 pragmatic knowledge. These abilities are reflected in how these learners produce utterances in the target language (TL) to communicate specific intentions, on the one hand, and how they interpret these intentions, which their utterances convey, on the other. Therefore, it is deemed worthy to note that in order to raise L2 and foreign language (S/FL) learners' abilities to perform speech acts, these learners must be aware of the sociopragmatic constraints that affect the selection of the appropriate linguistic forms to realize the targeted speech acts. This can definitely be maintained through the intervention of pragmatic instructions in L2 classroom setting.

Findings from studies investigating the role of instruction and the teachability of speech acts of requests, compliments, refusals, etc., have highlighted the positive effectiveness and outcomes of instructions on developing the L2 learners' use of particular pragmatic features. There has been a great demand for explicit instructions of both appropriate speech act pragmalinguistic realizations as well as situationalized features to reach proficiency in L2 pragmatic competence (PC). Scholars and researchers; e.g. House (1996); Tateyama (2001), have analyzed the role of instruction for performing particular speech acts as well as the effects of explicit and implicit instructions of these speech acts. The majority of these studies have favoured the explicit perspective, which focuses on description, explanation, discussion of particular pragmatic features and practicing of these features within the classroom settings towards the enhancement of L2 learners' pragmatic proficiency.

Furthermore, one of the most important approaches that can be implemented during the process of teaching pragmatics in L2 classrooms and hence developing L2 pragmatic proficiency is awareness raising (AR). Rose and Kasper (2001) claims that implementing pragmatic awareness raising perspective in L2 classroom setting has a distinct advantage on the learners' conception and production in pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects.

In an attempt to fill in this gap, the present study has tried to address the issue of developing the L2 PC through teaching the American speech act of refusals explicitly and in a conscious raising way to Iraqi FL learners of English at college level to validate other prior studies advocating the efficacy of instruction on developing L2 PC.

BACKGROUND

Unlike the L2 learners, FL learners do not have the opportunities to get exposed to authentic L2 use; therefore, they would not be exposed to sufficient pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic knowledge of the TL. Several studies such as Bardovi-Harlig & Dörnyei, (1988) and Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford (1996 cited in Rose & Kasper 2001: 11) claim that, without implicit or implicit instructions, many pragmatic aspects may not develop. Therefore, it seems essential to explicitly teach L2 learners appropriate pragmatic aspects, especially speech act patterns used in requests, refusals, invitations, compliments, etc. (ibid.).

Wildner-Basset, (1994) and Tateyama et al.,(1997 cited in ibid.: 12) dispel the idea that pragmatics should be taught only after L2 learners have a solid foundation in grammar and vocabulary. Their studies support the view that language development is function-driven. In other words, the need to understand and convey messages propels the learning of linguistic forms. It argued that developing grammatical competence alone does not guarantee developing PC. As a result, L2 learners have to be taught pragmatic features to be able to produce and interpret L2 messages properly; otherwise, inappropriate speech may cause L2 speakers to be unintentionally rude, uncultured, awkward and even abrupt and brusque in social communications.

For language use, pragmatic rules, as a matter of fact, are mostly subconscious and are not noticed by L2 learners until they are broken; i.e. feelings get hurt and offence takes place (Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor, 2003: 1). Accordingly, L2 learners must realize that what is accepted in their NL at a given context may not necessarily be the case in another language when they contact with

its native speakers (NSs). Moreover, Canale & Swain (1980) and Carroll (1978 cited in Witten, 2002: 3) state that NSs might tolerate and overlook the non-native speakers (NNSs') grammatical errors but might not do so with pragmatic errors at all stages of language development. As for NNSs, Kasper (1997) finds out that FL learners are more sensitive to and critical of grammatical errors; whereas L2 learners, on the reverse, are more aware of pragmatic violations. Kasper (1992 cited in *ibid.*: 17), adds that in order for an L2 learner to develop an appropriate pragmatic ability, two conditions should be met the input must be salient and noticed by the learner, and the learner should be given an ample opportunity to develop his communicative and pragmatic control.

The role of instruction and the teachability of specific pragmatic aspects have been drastically dealt with by scholars. Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor (2003: 3) claim that instructions, especially of an explicit nature, can make L2 learners more aware of why, when and how certain behaviour and practice take place. It can also help learners better understand and interpret certain formulas. Thus, the merit of pragmatic instructions is to raise learners' pragmatic awareness and provides them with the appropriate formulaic choices about their interactions in the TL. It also helps them get familiar to and choose from a variety of pragmatic devices on particular language norms (*ibid.*).

House (1996), Tateyama et al.(1997), Rose & Ng (2001) and Tateyama 2001) all cited in Safont Jordà (2004: 24) and (*ibid*)Nguyen (2005: 57), have analyzed the effect of instructions in performing certain speech acts, and more specifically the effect of implicit and explicit instructions and found out that L2 learners' pragmatic abilities were improved positively after instructions.

Kubota (1995 cited in *ibid*) also displays an advantage of instructions on English implicature for instructed Japanese FL learners of English over the uninstructed ones. However, most of the interventional studies demonstrate that explicit instruction is more effective in developing L2 PC than implicit instruction (House & Kasper (1981); House, 1996; Tateyama et al.(1997); Takahashi (2001) all cited in Takimoto (2006: 2) thus favor it over the latter. Additionally, explicit instruction is more intensive and varied than the implicit instruction, which, in turn, may require longer post-interventional/observational periods for certain features to be detected; a process known as retention (Silva, 2003: 57).

Comparing the results of discourse completion test (DCT) pre-test/post-test design, Kondo (2001: 50) shows that explicit pragmatic instruction has an undeniable influence on developing the refusal production of JFL learners of English.

However, there is but little evidence, as some research reveals, where some pragmatic aspects resist development through instruction. For example, Rose & Ng (2001 cited in Safont Jordà, 2004: 24-25) find out improvement through instructions in learners' metapragmatic awareness after five-weeks of instruction. They justify this negative outcome claiming that five-week instruction is not adequate for making substantial improvement to take place. Yoshimi (2001) also finds no evidence of improvement on the production of Japanese discourse markers by Japanese FL learners and attributes that to the methodological inadequacy of the study. Liddicoat & Grozet (2001 cited in Nguyen, 2005: 56), show that learners were not able to retain their improvement but only in the content of their responses arguing that the effects of instruction are not adequate to override the effect of time.

In spite of the fact that various studies have investigated the effects of instruction on various speech acts, instruction on refusals have not vastly been dealt with. There are only four studies which are particularly relevant to the present study.

King & Silver (1993) study the effects of instruction on NNSs of American English refusal strategies. adopting a pre-test/post-test design, they taught six college-level students refusal strategies. Their treatment instruction involves explicit teaching and role-playing to develop the students' pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic abilities basic to refusals in American English; Two weeks later, a delayed telephone interview post-test was performed to elicit the effects of instruction. The post-test questionnaire indicated very few effects; whereas the late telephone-interview indicated no detected effects.

Morrow's (1996 cited in Silva, 2003: 58) study adopts an explicit approach using model dialogues, explanations of semantic formulas, games and controlled output test-design. A pragmatic appropriateness judgment test and a pragmatic self-report were administered to assess the L2 learners' previous knowledge. The post-test included role-plays with holistic ratings to check the degree of clarity and politeness; it also included a comparison of pre-test and post-test performances of discourse features with those of NSs of English. A delayed post-test was conducted six months later. The findings showed improvements in both clarity and politeness between the pre-test and the post-test; yet, there was no significant difference between the pre-test and the delayed post-test results. This was attributed to the small number of participants as well as the effect of natural learning happening between the two post-tests. The result of the immediate post-test revealed that the instructions

helped the participants make refusals and complaints more clearly and politely native-like.

Kondo (2001: 59) applies a pre-test/post-test design also without a control group on thirty-five Japanese L2 learners of English. The instructional treatment on American refusals consists of implicit/explicit teaching including explicit explanation and analysis of semantic formulas, controlled free practices and cross-cultural comparison followed by discussion. Results showed improvement of the Japanese learners towards the patterns of American refusals.

Similarly, Silva's (2003) study investigates whether oriented instructions facilitate L2 pragmatic development, and the most appropriate way to introduce the pragmatic information to L2 learners of American refusals. In order to deliver the pragmalinguistic and the sociopragmatic aspects both of which affect refusals of L2 learners, the study incorporated metapragmatic awareness into the task-based methodological principles in its instructional treatment. The study also adopted a pre-test/post-test design with treatment and control groups. The subjects were fourteen lower intermediate learners (Japanese, Chinese, Taiwanese and Serbian) divided similarly into seven-control group and seven-treatment group. A qualitative discourse analytical approach was administered. The findings consequently showed that instruction enhanced the L2 pragmatic ability of performing English refusals.

The research work above clearly indicates that the results of teaching the pragmatics of language functions are far from being decisive. This implies that more studies in this area are still needed in this respect.

The present study, in turn, aimed at evaluating qualitatively and quantitatively the impact of explicit instructions on developing the speech act of American refusals to offer of the Iraqi FL learners of English at college level.

To this end, the present study intends to address the following questions:

1. Does interventional explicit instruction on American refusals to offer lead to any development and enhancement in the instructed subjects' PC?
2. Does the involvement of AR perspective in the instructional sessions help facilitating comprehension and production of L2 refusal expressions?

It is hypothesized that teaching the semantic formulas of American refusals to offer in various contexts explicitly using conscious raising technique enhances appropriate use of English refusals in the appropriate contexts.

METHOD

SUBJECTS

Forty-four 1st year students studying in the Dept. of English, College of Arts, University of Mosul, were chosen to be the subjects of the present study. Two of three actual groups of the 1st year students were selected to be the treatment and control groups of the present study; Group A was randomly chosen to be the treatment group subjected to refusal instructional session, and group B was chosen to be the control group that received no refusal instruction. Each of the two groups consisted of 22 subjects excluding some of the initial subjects due to either the incompleteness of their pre- or

post-test papers or their non-attendance of the instructional sessions. The treatment group consisted of 5 males and 17 females; whereas the control group involved 10 male and 12 female subjects participating in the three tests. In addition, the interventional instructional sessions were conducted precisely after the mid-term exams.

Both the groups were taught by the researcher so as to avoid teacher variable.

The “conversation” class was chosen to be the core subject during which the instructional sessions for both groups were decided to be given. Each instructional phase lasted 50 minutes for both the treatment and the control groups. The whole instructional sessions for each group lasted two weeks respectively during which two interventional instructions a week were given. Thus, the treatment group was receiving the proposed instructions on refusals, while the control group received instructions on various topics the way they usually accustomed to .

INSTRUMENT

The present study makes use of a modified version of Beebe et al.’s Discourse Completion Test (1990 cited in Silva, 2003: 61). This tool is considered one of the most typical elicitation speech act means for data collection in ILP studies, and the best means to provide answers and confirmation to the present study’s questions and hypotheses posed. Thus, to examine the effect of explicit instruction on the subjects’ pragmatic performance, and to detect any evidence of transfer, three types of written DCTs were used: 1)

Arabic test (see Appendix A), 2) English pre-test and 3) the English post-test (see Appendix B).

The Arabic test was conducted to match the English pre-test so as to see whether there was any effect of the subjects' native language ; i.e. Arabic, on their L2; i.e. English, when performing refusals in English prior to any instruction, and to identify any evidence of positive or negative PT. The English pre-test, was conducted to investigate the subjects' existing pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic knowledge concerning American refusals to offer before the instructions took place. The post-test, in turn, aimed at examining the development especially in the treatment group's conception and production of American refusals regarding both the pragmalinguistic and the sociopragmatic features after receiving instructions in refusal to offers. The post-test responses were aimed to be checked against their pre-test performance as well as the control group's post-test performance.

Each of these three DCTs consisted of 4 situations of offers eliciting refusals all of which refer to doing a favor to someone; viz giving a ride, a cup of tea or a piece of candy to someone. It is worth noting here that the four situations depict the three status differential factors affecting the types of refusal performed and one situation included an additional social distance differential. Table (1) below shows the situations with some explanations provided for each:

Table (1): the Present Study DCTs' Refusal Situations.

A noteworthy matter important to be raised here is that since this study could not have a direct real online American NSs' responses as an authentic baseline to rely on, the DCT situations were a bit of fabricated situations done by the researcher relying on

item DCT	Hearer's status relative to refuser	Interlocutors involved	Explanations
#1	higher-status	college teacher vs. student	refusing a ride offer
#2	lower- status	student vs. dept. cleaner	refusing a cup of tea offer
#3	equal-status	classmate vs.	refusing a piece of
#4	equal-distance	brother vs. brother	refusing a cup of tea offer

certain refusal responses taken from dialogues or even examples mentioned in some relevant literature. These efforts were done only to ensure the validity of the responses to be American native-like.

INSTRUCTIONAL SESSION PROCEDURE

The present study has proposed an inductive eclectic explicit technique for teaching American refusals to the treatment subjects. The instructions proposed were interventional ones divided into sequential cognitive gradational phases involving descriptions, explanations, and discussions of refusals and practice activities of this feature. These phases were as follows:

- **Feeling Segment:**

The aim of this phase was to infer what pragmatic knowledge subjects already had concerning refusals prior to any instruction.

- **Thinking Segment:**

This segment took into account displaying how refusals could be managed through various semantic sets (see Appendix C) and how these sets are arranged in various semantic formulas according to contextual factors through inductive instructions and explanations

relying on prior studies eliciting these formulas such as Hussein's (2003: 82).

- **Understanding Segment:**

This segment focused on making comparison between the Iraqi and American refusals. Then discussion of the results obtained was made and according to which conclusions were drawn.

- **Subjects' Practice Segment:**

This phase gave the subjects the opportunities to practice what they learned in the previous segments and enabled the researcher to check the degree of the subjects' pragmatic development. Therefore, it can be called 'subjects' project activity'. Accordingly, the subjects should practice the structures in the situation given to be pragmatically competent. Based on these notions, this phase emphasizes role-play activities to provide spontaneity and automaticity and not only repetitions and drills.

These the segments were proposed implemented on the treatment subjects. The aim was to see the effect of explicit interventional instructional sessions on developing the subjects' competence in performing refusals to offer in the L2 .

The control group, received instructions different from those given to the treatment group. They were given general talks and conversational practice on various topics.

During the first two lectures, the control group subjects were given dialogues dealing with *how to book a room at a hotel*. The subjects were asked to read the dialogues in pair-groups, Then general discussion followed the reading in which the topics and the figures involved in the dialogues were illuminated. The second two

lectures focused on the topic “*describing persons*”. The subjects were given instructions on the useful adjectives implemented in describing persons, their appropriate order and arrangement. Then general discussions and practices were made.

Data Analysis

After encoding the data collected, certain analytical and statistical procedures were conducted. Two types of data analysis approaches; viz. qualitative and quantitative, were determined to be conducted on these data in order to test the validity of the hypotheses posed by the present study.

The qualitative analysis involves examining the contents and the orders of the semantic sets used in the semantic formulas manipulated by each group in the three DCTs. The quantitative analysis investigates the frequency count of each strategy used in the semantic formula and the number of the semantic sets in these formulas

Finally, to determine whether any difference detected between the pre- and post-test responses of each group separately was significant or non-significant, a paired T-test using on SPSS program was conducted for this purpose.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Refusals to offer were covered during instructions according to the two types of the social factors, namely: social status and social distance

Refusal to Higher-Status Interlocutor’s Offer (Situation # 1):

The Impact of Explicit Instruction on Developing Pragmatic ...

Dr. Basim Yehya Jasim Bann Ahmed Hamuody

In refusing an offer from higher-status, Americans begin with ‘positive opinion’, then ‘regret’ followed by the direct ‘No’ or ‘NA’ and end with ‘excuse’ (Hussein, 2003: 82). Table (2) below shows the control and the treatment groups’ management in the three DCTs related to this type of refusal.

Table (2): Frequency Count, Content & Order of Semantic formulas in the Three DCTs of both Control & Treatment Groups in Refusing Offers to higher-Status Interlocutor.

OFFER		ST-HIGH	Arabic								pre-test								post-test									
no	semantic role	Arabic	%	Arabic	%	Arabic	%	Arabic	%	pretest	%	pretest	%	pretest	%	pretest	%	posttest	%	posttest	%	posttest	%	posttest	%			
control	1	positive filler	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00		
	2	hedging	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00		
	3	positive opinion	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	4	wish	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	5	regret	3	13.64	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	7	31.82	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	7	31.82	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	6	excuse	0	0.00	11	50.00	6	27.27	0	0.00	0	0.00	12	54.55	1	4.55	0	0.00	1	4.55	9	40.91	4	18.18	0	0.00	0	0.00
	7	gratitude	15	68.18	3	13.64	1	4.55	0	0.00	10	45.45	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	7	31.82	4	18.18	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	8	NA	1	4.55	5	22.73	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55	6	27.27	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	9	No	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	18.18	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	10	alternative	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	11	self-defence	3	13.64	2	9.09	1	4.55	1	4.55	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	12	self-attacks	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	13	self-praise	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	14	promise	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	15	self-defence	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	16	performance	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total		22		21		8		1		22		16		1		0		22		21		4		0		0		
Treatment	1	positive filler	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00		
	2	hedging	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00		
	3	positive opinion	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	10	45.45	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00		
	4	wish	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	13.64	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00		
	5	regret	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	7	31.82	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	11	50.00	1	4.55	0	0.00		
	6	excuse	0	0.00	15	68.18	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	10	45.45	3	13.64	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	9.09	14	63.64	5	22.73		
	7	gratitude	13	59.09	2	9.09	1	4.55	0	0.00	9	40.91	5	22.73	1	4.55	1	4.55	6	27.27	4	18.18	1	4.55	3	13.64		
	8	NA	0	0.00	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	9.09	4	18.18	0	0.00		
	9	No	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	18.18	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00		
	10	alternative	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00		
	11	self-defence	4	18.18	2	9.09	0	0.00	1	4.55	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55	1	4.55	0	0.00		
	12	self-attacks	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00		
	13	self-praise	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00		
	14	promise	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00		
	15	self-defence	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00		
	16	performance	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00		
Total		22		21		2		0		22		19		4		1		22		22		21		8				

As one of the Arabic cultures which are characterized as polite cultures, Iraqis, represented by the present study’s subjects, showed their ‘gratitude’ for any favour given to them. Accordingly, this strategy is much used to initiate their refusals with such as, ‘شكراً’

'جزياً', 'أشكرك' scoring 59.05% and 68.18% for both groups respectively. Besides, there are some occurrences of 'regret' such as 'اعذرنى', 'أسف' and 'off the hook' such as, 'لا أريد أن أتعبك معي / أكلفك /', 'أنقل عليك', 'طريقي غير طريقك', 'انتظر أخي / صديقي سيأتي ليأخذني', 'معاي مظلة مطرية'. Besides, there are also noticeable occurrences of 'gratitude', 'NA' and 'off the hook' in this position. The use of 'excuse', furthermore, extends to the third position but scoring very slight percentages there; i.e. 4.55% and 27.27% for both groups respectively. The following examples illustrate these aforementioned results:

'أشكرك أستاذ، راح اطلع من الباب الثاني، 'أسف لأنني طريقي غير طريقك، شكراً،
'لا شكراً راح أخذ سيارة أجرة، 'شكراً جزياً لا أريد أن أتعبك معي'.

In refusals to offers the pre-tests in both groups' responses, both groups transfer the Iraqi strategies used in refusals of offer and the orders of the semantic formulas to performing the American English refusals. Thus, 'gratitude' scoring 40.91% and 45.45% and 'regret' identically scoring 31.82% occurred in the first position. This position also shows occurrences of the direct 'No' as "No, thank you" which is a literal translation of 'لا شكراً'. The second position showed too much occurrences of 'excuse' as the major strategy in this position scoring 45.45% and 54.55% for both groups respectively. However, there is a slight existence of 'gratitude', 'NA' and 'off the hook' there. The third position similar to the Arabic test showed a slight percentage of 'excuse' to reach 13.64% for treatment and only 4.55% for the control groups' results.

The results above clearly shows the transfer of the Iraqi concept of refusals in this context verbalized in the L2 performance;

i.e. transferring the Iraqi semantic formula as well as the Iraqi literal translation of the expressions to the L2 refusal production. The following examples show these findings:

“Thank you very much, but your way is different my way”, *“but my way isn’t the way of you”*, *“but my way is opposite of yours”*.

It is worth noting furthermore that there were few responses that completely denoted that L1 PT and literal translation really existed such as, “I don’t want to make you tired!” which is a literal translation of a common face-saving expression in the Iraqi context in such situation “لا أريد أن أتعبك معي” or “take your rest” a literal translation of the Iraqi expression “خذ راحتك”.

The post-test results, of the control group showed no development in their performance. In other words, the same strategies used in the previous (table) DCTs were also used but with some rise or fall in the percentages scored. Thus, ‘gratitude’, ‘regret’ and the direct ‘No’ occur in the first position; ‘excuse’, ‘gratitude’ and ‘NA’ in the second and finally ‘excuse’ in the third position. This result is definitely due to the lack of refusal instructions and procedure given to this class.

By contrast, the treatment group, as Table (2) also revealed, showed changes after instruction from their two previous manipulations and from the control’s performance. Following the American semantic order in this context, American used ‘positive opinion’ 45.45% and ‘wish’ 13.64% in the first position. However, there were still some occurrences of ‘gratitude’ but of 27.27% in this position. The second position showed much use of ‘regret’ to score 50%. Besides, there were some slight occurrences of other

-
- For convenience, grammatical mistakes were not taken into consideration during the data analysis or even during the instructional sessions unless they are crucial ones.

strategies such as ‘excuse’, ‘gratitude’ and ‘NA’. As for the third position, there were many uses of ‘excuse’ to score 63.64% and ‘NA’ to score 18.18%. The fourth and the last position also shows some noticeable occurrences of ‘excuse’ in about 22.73% and ‘gratitude’ in 13.64%. The following examples illustrate how the treatment group showed development in their performance in the post-test:

- Subject # 20:

• **Pre-test response:**

Thank you very much, but my way is not.

• **Post-test response:**

That’s very kind of you but my way is not yours. Thank you very much.

- Subject # 11:

• **Pre-test response:**

No, thank you very much.

• **Post-test response:**

That’s very kind of you but you don’t have to, I can reach the gate by myself, Thank you so much.

In the light of the results obtained, one can see the changes in the subjects’ performance especially Subject #11 towards the L2 native-like production whether sticking to the strategies used, the order followed, the longitudinal responses as means of face-work or even changing towards the American expressions common in such context.

Concentrating again on Table (2) on the control group’s management, it showed bit of homogeneity in the total summation of the strategies used per positions in the three DCTs; viz. 22, 21, 8,

The Impact of Explicit Instruction on Developing Pragmatic ...

Dr. Basim Yehya Jasim Bann Ahmed Hamuody

1 vs. 22, 16, 1 and 22, 21, 4, though there was some decrease in the pre-test second and third positions.

By contrast, the same table showed that the treatment group had increased the total number of the strategies used per positions they used in the post-test being aware that the more they prolong their refusals, the more face-saving their refusals would be. Thus, the total of strategies per positions scores 22, 22, 21, 8 in the post-test vs. 22, 21, 2 and 22, 19, 4, 1 in both the Arabic and the pre-tests respectively.

Refusals to Lower-Status Interlocutor’s Offer (Situation # 2):

Americans start their refusals to lower-status interlocutors with ‘gratitude’ or ‘positive opinion’, then ‘regret’, next ‘No/NA’ and finally end their refusals with ‘excuse’ (Hussein, 2003: 131).

In their Iraqi refusals, both groups, as Table (3) below illustrates, made much use of ‘gratitude’; viz. 50% for the control and 63.64% for the treatment, ‘regret’, ‘NA’ and the direct ‘No’.

Table (3): Frequency Count, Content & Order of Semantic formulas in the Three DCTs of both Control & Treatment Groups in Refusing Offers to Lower-Status Interlocutor.

OFFER		ST	LOW	15	Arabic								pre-test				post-test							
no	semantic code	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	
control	1	phrase filler	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	2	hedging	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	3	positive opinion	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00
	4	wish	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	5	regret	7	31.82	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	27.27	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	9.09	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00
	6	excuse	1	4.55	12	54.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	8	36.36	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	18.18	4	18.18
	7	gratitude	11	50.00	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	10	45.45	2	9.09	1	4.55	0	0.00	13	59.09	5	22.73	0	0.00
	8	NA	3	13.64	6	27.27	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	9.09	9	40.91	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	9.09	7	31.82	2	9.09
	9	No	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	13.64	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	13.64	0	0.00	0	0.00
	10	alternative	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	11	off the book	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	12	at all points	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	13	start phrase	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	14	promise	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	15	self defense	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	16	performative	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	Total		22		19		0		0		22		19		4		0		22		20		6	
Treatment	1	phrase filler	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	2	hedging	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55
	3	positive opinion	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	11	50.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	4	wish	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	27.27	0	0.00	0	0.00
	5	regret	3	13.64	10	45.45	1	4.55	0	0.00	6	27.27	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	9.09	9	40.91	3	13.64	0	0.00
	6	excuse	0	0.00	9	40.91	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	27.27	4	18.18	0	0.00	1	4.55	10	45.45	7	31.82
	7	gratitude	14	63.64	2	9.09	1	4.55	0	0.00	8	36.36	6	27.27	1	4.55	0	0.00	2	9.09	1	4.55	0	0.00
	8	NA	3	13.64	10	45.45	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55	8	36.36	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	11	50.00	8	36.36
	9	No	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	22.73	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00
	10	alternative	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	11	off the book	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	12	at all points	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	13	start phrase	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	14	promise	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55
	15	self defense	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	16	performative	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	Total		22		21		4		0		22		21		6		0		22		22		21	

The second position, in turn, showed higher percentages of both 'excuse' scoring 54% for the control and 40.91% for the treatment, and 'NA' scoring 27.27% and 45.45% for both groups respectively. As for the third position, it only showed few percentages of 'excuse', 'regret' and 'gratitude' for the treatment group only. The following examples illustrate these findings:

'متأسف لا أريد شرب الشاي الآن،' 'شكراً، لا أستطيع شرب الشاي في وقت متأخر،'
'لا أستطيع، لا أحب الشاي،' 'شكراً، لا أريد شرب الشاي،' 'لا شكراً، تناولت الشاي قبل قليل.'

Concentrating on the pre-test results in the same table, both the treatment and the control groups transferred the typical strategies used in the Arabic test per positions but with slight different percentages. Thus, 'gratitude' of 45.45% and 36.36%, 'regret', 'NA' as well as 'No' score the only higher strategies in the first position. The second position also showed higher scores for 'excuse', 'gratitude' and 'NA' similar to the Arabic test. As for the third position, it showed occurrences of only 'excuse' and 'gratitude', yet not exceeding 4.55%. Thus, the results of the pre-tests of both groups reassure the existence of PT; i.e. what the subjects were doing was only transferring their Iraqi concept concerning both the pragmalinguistic and the sociopragmatic features to the L2 production since they had no other choice in this ILP stage with the absence of instructions and AR procedure. The

following examples illustrate the PT reflected in a comparison between the Arabic and the English pre-tests:

‘كلا لا أريد أن أشرب الشاي’, ‘*I don't want to, I don't drink tea*’;

‘لا، لا أريد شايًا الآن’, ‘*No, I am not want tea now*’;

‘لا أريد أن أشرب شايًا’, ‘*I don't want, I don't drink tea*’;

Focusing on the post-tests of both groups, the control group, as the latest Table (3) revealed, extremely used the same strategies per positions and even more in the same number of sets per the semantic formula. ‘Regret’, ‘gratitude’, ‘No’ and ‘NA’ showed higher percentages in the first position; ‘excuse’, ‘gratitude’ and ‘NA’ in the second position and finally ‘excuse’ and slightly ‘NA’ ended semantic formula of the control’s post-test responses. This homogeneity in the control’s post-test responses was simply due to the lack of the needed instruction to develop their ILP stage and to make them aware of the cross-cultural differences between the two languages.

By contrast, after being instructed on American refusals, the treatment subjects showed a big difference in their L2 management particularly when compared with their pre-test’s or with the control’s post-test responses (see Table (3) again). Consequently, the first position shows higher existence of the ‘positive opinion’ scoring 50% of the whole occurrences and its identical strategy; i.e. ‘wish’ scoring 27.27% whereas ‘regret’ and ‘No’ decreased to read 9.09% for the former and only 4.55% for the latter. As for ‘gratitude’, it showed only 9.09% in this position. The second position showed greater existence of ‘regret’ and ‘NA’ scoring 40.91% and 50% respectively. The third position revealed higher percentages for both ‘NA’ scoring 36.36% and ‘excuse’ scoring 45.45%. The use of ‘excuse’ also extended to the fourth and fifth

positions scoring 31.82% and 9.09% respectively there. The following examples illustrate these findings:

- Subject # 9:

• **Pre-test:**

That's very kind of you, but I don't feel like drinking tea.

• **Post-test:**

That's a good idea, but I'm sorry. I am not willing to. You know I don't drink tea at such time of the day.

- Subject # 7:

• **Pre-test:**

I don't want. I am busy now.

• **Post-test:**

That's very kind of you, but sorry, I don't like to have a cup of tea. I am studying now.

Depending on the previous analyses, Table (3) indicated the amount of strategies used by the control group. As the table revealed, this group made use of an identical semantic formulas in three DCTs concerning the summation of the total strategies used per positions; viz. 22, 19 in the Arabic; 22, 19, 4 in the pre- and 22, 20, 6 in the post-tests. This finding also affirmed both the PT as well as the shortage of refusal explicit instruction in the control class.

Conversely, the second part of Table (3) revealed that the treatment group showed different summations of the strategies used per positions in the three DCTs. As the table indicated, the treatment subjects showed development not only in the content of the semantic formula, but also in the amount of the appropriate strategies used by most of the subjects to reach 22, 22, 21, 8, 3 almost in 5 sets especially when compared with their Arabic

The Impact of Explicit Instruction on Developing Pragmatic ...

Dr. Basim Yehya Jasim Bann Ahmed Hamuody

management 22, 21, 4 or their pre-test management 22, 21, 6 or even with all of the control's previously mentioned results.

Refusal to Equal-Status Interlocutor's Offer (Sit. # 3)

In refusing offers of equal-status interlocutors, Americans usually begin their semantic formulas with 'positive opinion' or 'gratitude', then show their 'regret', next use the direct 'No' or 'NA' and finally end their refusal with 'excuse' (Hussein, 2003: 82).

On beholding Table (4) below concerning both the control and the treatment groups' responses to this situation; viz. # 3, both groups started their Iraqi Arabic responses with 'gratitude' such as "شكراً جزيلاً", "ممنون" scoring 59.09% for the treatment and 54.55% for the control groups as their best means to show both their gratefulness to the favour given as well as their politeness not to hurt the addressee's face for their non-compliance.

Table (4): Frequency Count, Content & Order of Semantic formulas in the Three DCTs of both Control & Treatment Groups in Refusing Offers to Equal-Status Interlocutor.

OFFER	ST.EQUAL	6	Arabic								pre-test								post-test									
			no	tokens	%	no	tokens	%	no	tokens	%	pretest1	%	pretest2	%	pretest3	%	pretest4	%	posttest1	%	posttest2	%	posttest3	%	posttest4	%	
control	1	pause filler	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	2	hedging	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	3	part op.	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	4	wish	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	5	regret	7	31.82	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	13.64	1	4.55	1	4.55	0	0.00	3	13.64	1	4.55	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00
	6	excuse	0	0.00	8	36.36	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	9.09	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	27.27	6	27.27	0	0.00	0	0.00
	7	gratitude	12	54.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	11	50.00	3	13.64	0	0.00	0	0.00	13	59.09	4	18.18	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00
	8	NA	1	4.55	13	59.09	1	4.55	0	0.00	2	9.09	13	59.09	1	4.55	0	0.00	1	4.55	10	45.45	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	9	No	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	22.73	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	18.18	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	10	alternative	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	11	off the hook	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	12	at. of. phrase	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	13	self praise	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	14	promise	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	15	self defense	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	16	performative	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	Total			22		21		1		0		22		19		3		0		22		22		8		0		0
Treatment	1	pause filler	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	2	hedging	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	3	part opinion	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	14	63.64	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	4	wish	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	18.18	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	13.64	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	5	regret	4	18.18	1	4.55	2	9.09	0	0.00	3	13.64	1	4.55	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	17	77.27	3	13.64	0	0.00	1	4.55
	6	excuse	0	0.00	12	54.55	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	7	31.82	5	22.73	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	10	45.45	11	50.00	1	4.55
	7	gratitude	13	59.09	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	7	31.82	8	36.36	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	22.73	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55
	8	NA	3	13.64	6	27.27	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	27.27	5	22.73	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	22.73	9	40.91	0	0.00	0	0.00
	9	No	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	8	36.36	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	10	alternative	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	11	off the hook	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	12	at. of. phrase	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	13	self praise	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	14	promise	0	0.00	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	15	self defense	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	16	performative	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	Total			22		22		4		0		22		22		11		0		22		22		22		11		3

There were also some occurrences of 'regret' scoring 31.82% and 18.18% as well as the direct refusals 'NA' and 'No'. Something noteworthy here that the use of 'No' was not said for itself alone but immediately followed by the strategy of 'gratitude' in the second position forming a phrase common in the Iraqi context as "لا شكراً". In addition, this position; also recorded higher percentages of 'excuse' for both groups scoring 54.55% and 36.36% as well as respectively 'NA' scoring 27.27% and 59.09% for each group respectively. As for the last position, it revealed slight occurrences of both 'excuse' and 'regret' scoring 9.09% each by the control group and occurrences of 'NA' scoring 4.55% for the treatment group. The following examples were taken from both groups' 'لا شكراً تناولت واحدة قبل قليل،' 'شكراً أنا أعمل حمية غذائية،' 'شكراً، أنا لست جائعاً،' 'متأسف جداً لكنني لا أتناول الكثير من الحلويات،' 'ممنون، ما أطيق،' 'شكراً جزيلاً، اعتذر عن تناول الحلوى لأن أسناني تؤلمني'.

Referring again to Table (4) focusing on the pre-test part affected by the Iraqi pragmatic conceptualization, both groups made use of 'gratitude' scoring 50% and 31.82% for both groups respectively, 'regret' and 'No' in the first position. As for the second position of the semantic formula in this ILP phase, it showed

higher percentages of ‘excuse’, ‘gratitude’ and ‘NA’ for the treatment and ‘NA’ of 59.09%, ‘gratitude’ and ‘excuse’ for the control group. It is worth noting here that the Iraqi common use of ”لا شكراً” transferred here but this time to English ; viz. ‘No, thank you’ which is a clear indication of the PT that occurred in this stage since the subjects had not yet been aware of the L2 pragmalinguistics and the L2 common expressions used. Reaching the third position, the treatment group ended their refusals to peers’ offers with either ‘excuse’ or ‘NA’ scoring 22.73% each; whereas the control group subjects made very slight percentages of ‘regret’, ‘excuse’ and ‘No’ not exceeding 4.55% each.

Thus, in the light of the pre-test results of both groups, one can easily see the influence of the L1 pragmatic conceptualization on the L2 pragmatic performances. This implies the existence of PT in this ILP phase. The following examples clarify the findings above:

“No, thank you, I eat enough”, “Thank you, I am not hungry”, “Thank you, I can’t eat a piece of candy”, “Sorry, I can’t, I am sick”, “Thank you very much, I couldn’t that” or the vague answer “Thank you, my stomach is full/ is closed” a literal translation of the Iraqi expression “معدتي ممتلئة”.

Similarly, the post-test of the control group showed no significant differences from their pre-test implementations. ‘Gratitude’ of 59.09%, ‘regret; and ‘No’ construct the greatest occurrences in the first position; ‘NA’ of 45.45%, ‘regret’ of 27.27% and ‘gratitude’ of 18.18% were used in the second position and ‘excuse’ of 27.27%, ‘regret’ and ‘gratitude’ of 4.55% each of which were used in the third and last position.

The treatment group, by contrast, showed a change towards the American native-like refusals after receiving explicitly several refusals instructions. This can be perceived in both of the content

and the orders of the semantic formulas conducted (see Table (4) again). Thus, 'positive opinion' showed higher existence to score 63.64% as an important strategy used to begin American refusals with. Besides, this position also showed some existence of both 'wish' as an identical strategy to 'positive opinion', as well as 'gratitude', which, in turn, showed lesser percentage than its score in the previous tests. 'Regret' disappeared in this position to score higher percentage of 77.27% in the second position as its right place, also the 'NA' in this place which scored, in turn, 22.73%. The third position, also consists of 'NA' scoring 40.91% besides 45.45% for 'excuse' and 13.64% for 'regret'. The fourth position, recorded 50% for 'excuse' as the only strategy used there, yet by only half of the subjects. As for the second half, they used it in the preceding position forming 45.45% and excluding the 'NA' strategy there. It is worth noting, furthermore, that there were very few subjects who extended their refusal expressions to the fifth position forming three occurrences, while the sixth position recorded only one case of 'gratitude'.

The following examples show the differences between the pre- and the post-tests' performance for the treatment subjects:

- Subject # 13:

• **Pre-test:**

Thank you very much, but I don't eat much sweet.

• **Post-test:**

I really like to but I'm sorry, I can't I have a toothache and I'll go to the dentist today.

- Subject # 21:

• **Pre-test:**

I wish I could, but I'm sorry. I don't like to.

• **Post-test:**

Thank you so much, but I'm sorry. I can't, I've already have one.

In sum, the aforementioned post-test results indicated that the treatment subjects did not show these changes and development in their L2 performance only but after the instructional sessions had taken place during which they became aware of how refusals should be implemented in the L2 context.

Depending on the preceding analyses, Table (4) also shows homogeneity in the control's productions in the three DCTs. As can be seen in this table, the control group approximately made use of the same total summation of strategies per positions in the three DCTs; i.e. 22, 21, 1 in the Arabic; 22, 19, 3 in the pre- and 22, 22, 8 in the post-tests similarly done in 3 sets respectively. This homogeneity comes as a result of both PT and the deliberate lack of the refusals instructions needed.

On the contrary, the treatment subjects showed a great change. As it is also clear in Table (4), the treatment subjects showed a great management in the total of strategies used per positions in the post-test scoring 22, 22, 22, 11, 3, 1 particularly when compared with both their pre-test performance 22, 22, 11 or the Arabic performance 22, 22, 4 both of which, in turn, showed homogeneity to those managed by the control group. The treatment post-test result is definitely due to the efficacy of explicit instructions.

Refusal to Equal-Distant Interlocutor's Offer (Situation # 4):

Americans, as numerous studies claim, are not sensitive to the distance factor. Therefore, when making refusals to offers regarding this factor, they make approximately the same formula starting with 'gratitudde' or 'positive opinion', then using 'regret' followed by the

direct 'No' or the 'NA' strategy then ending their refusals with 'excuse'. The three DCTs, therefore, focused on a situation whereby the subjects were going to refuse an offer from an equal-distant interlocutor; i.e. a brother. Table (5) below shows both groups' results; i.e., the treatment and the control groups, in the three DCTs.

The Impact of Explicit Instruction on Developing Pragmatic ...

Dr. Basim Yehya Jasim Bann Ahmed Hamuody

Table (5): Frequency Count, Content & Order of Semantic formulas in the Three DCTs of both Control & Treatment Groups in Refusing Offers to Equal-Distant Interlocutor.

OFFER		Arabic-test				pre-test				post-test														
DIS.EQUAL	14																							
no	semantic role	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%			
Treatment	1	pause filler	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00		
	2	hedging	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00
	3	poor opinion	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	9	40.91	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	4	wish	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	13.64	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	5	regret	0	0.00	2	9.09	0	0.00	1	4.55	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	10	45.45	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00
	6	excuse	1	4.55	8	36.36	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	18.18	3	13.64	0	0.00	2	9.09	9	40.91	7	31.82
	7	gratitude	8	36.36	4	18.18	0	0.00	0	0.00	7	31.82	5	22.73	0	0.00	9	40.91	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00
	8	NA	9	40.91	5	22.73	2	9.09	0	0.00	3	13.64	12	54.55	5	22.73	0	0.00	1	4.55	9	40.91	8	36.36
	9	No	4	18.18	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	8	36.36	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	10	alternative	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00
	11	off the hook	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	12	st. of pleasur	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	13	st. of pleasur	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	14	promise	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	15	self defense	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	16	performative	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	Total		22	19	4	0	22	22	8	0	22	22	19	8	2	0								
	OFFER		Arabic-test				pre-test				post-test													
DIS.EQUAL	14																							
no	semantic role	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	
control	1	pause filler	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	2	hedging	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	3	poor opinion	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	4	wish	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	5	regret	4	18.18	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	18.18	3	13.64	0	0.00	4	18.18	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	6	excuse	1	4.55	2	9.09	1	4.55	0	0.00	1	4.55	4	18.18	2	9.09	0	0.00	6	27.27	3	13.64	0	0.00
	7	gratitude	11	50.00	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	12	54.55	2	9.09	1	4.55	0	0.00	11	50.00	4	18.18	0	0.00
	8	NA	3	13.64	12	54.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.55	10	45.45	0	0.00	2	9.09	10	45.45	2	9.09	0	0.00
	9	No	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	13.64	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	10	alternative	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	11	off the hook	1	4.55	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	12	st. of pleasur	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	13	st. of principle	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	14	promise	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	15	self defense	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	16	performative	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	Total		22	17	1	0	22	19	3	0	22	20	5	0	0	0								

On checking the two groups' Arabic results, both subjects tended to start their refusals with 'gratitude' such as "شكرا" to score 36.36% in the treatment and 50% in the control's responses. It is worth mentioning that sometimes this strategy was preceded by the direct "No" to become "لا شكرا". Therefore, the direct 'No' shows some existence in this position to score 18.18% vs. 9.09% in both groups' responses respectively. Accordingly the 'gratitude' strategy scored the same percentages but in the second position; i.e., 18.18% vs. 9.09% respectively.

The first position also showed some uses of 'NA' strategy such as "لا اقدر", "لا أريد", "لا استطيع", to score 40.91% vs. 13.64% for both groups respectively. In addition, there were also some occurrences of 'regret' such as "اعذرنى", "أسف" to score 18.18% particularly done by the control group.

Turning to the second position of the Arabic refusal formula, there was much concentration on either 'NA' or 'excuse' by the two groups. For instance, the treatment group showed utilization of these two strategies to read 36.36% for 'excuse' and 22.73% for 'NA', where the control showed use of only 9.09% for 'excuse' but 54.55% for 'NA' strategies. There was also few existence of 'regret' to form 9.09% used only by the treatment group. Reaching the third position in this formula, it showed very few occurrences of 'excuse' and 'NA' both of which were not exceeding 9.09% respectively. Thus, in the light of the aforementioned results obtained, Iraqi refusal formula to such situation is of the following order:

[(gratitude/regret/No)+(NA/excuse/regret/gratitude)+(excuse/NA)]

The following examples illustrate these results:

"لا شكرا، لا أريد،" "لا أريد، أنا لا اشرب الشاي"، "شكرا، اعتذر لأنني الآن شربت"،
شكرا لا أحب الشاي وأنت تعرف، أسف"، "أنا لا أحب الشاي"، "شكرا لا أستطيع شربه
الآن".

As for the pre-test results, the previous table showed similar results to those obtained in the Arabic test. As a result, the first position showed much reliance on 'gratitude' to score 54.55% and 31.82% for both groups respectively. In addition, this position also showed occurrences of 'NA', 'regret' and the direct 'No' as they were used by both groups in the Arabic test. It is worth mentioning, furthermore, that the use of the direct 'No' in this position was also related to the use of 'gratitude' in the second position that both scores approximately similar percentages to form the expression "*No, thank you*", a literal translation of the Arabic expression, "لا شكرا".

The second position also showed much focus on 'NA' strategy to score 54.55% vs. 45.54% in both groups' responses respectively. It also revealed some existence of 'excuse' to similarly scoring the same percentage by both groups; and 'regret' to score 4.55% vs. 13.64% by both groups respectively. The third position, showed very few percentages of 'excuse' scoring 13.64% vs. 9.09% for both groups and some existence of 22.73% for 'NA' implemented only by the treatment group. In sum, the similarities in both tests results done by both groups point to the existence of PT at this ILP stage. The following examples taken from various responses of both groups confirm the results above:

"No, thank you, I don't like tea", "I don't want, I am busy now", "I don't want, I don't drink tea", "No, thank you, I drank one".

The post-test, on the other hand, indicated different outcomes in the results obtained especially by the treatment group. To start with, the control group showed concentration on the same strategies they used per positions in the pre-test. Thus, 'gratitude' of 50% constituted the main strategy used in the first position. In addition, 'NA', the direct 'No' and 'regret' were also used here scoring similarly 9.09% for the two former strategies and 18.18% for the latter one. However, some few existence of 'wish' as well as 'positive opinion' but not exceeding 9.09% is also noticeable in this position.

Similar to the Arabic and the pre-tests' manipulations, the second position revealed only existence of 'NA', 'excuse' and 'gratitude' to score 45.45%, 27.27% and 18.18% respectively. The use of 'excuse' and 'NA' also extends to the third position to score 13.64% vs. 9.09% respectively. Thus, the control group still showed evidence of PT from their L1 conception since they were not given any refusal instruction that prevented such phenomenon to occur.

As for the treatment group, and particularly after taking instructions and making practice of how to refuse offers; they showed noticeable changes from their pre-test performance and this finding is greatly in line with Kondo's (2001) that explicit instruction shows undeniable differences between the L2 learners in the post-test results from their pre-test results. Thus, the first position of the semantic formula resulted from this group's responses showed a rise in the use of both 'positive opinion' and 'gratitude' strategies to score similarly 40.91% each. The second position, in turn, shows much reliance on both 'regret' and 'NA' to score 45.45% vs. 40.91% respectively. As for the third position, it shows a rise in the occurrences of both 'excuse' and 'gratitude' to

score 40.91% vs. 36.36% respectively. The use of ‘excuse’ also extends to the fourth and the fifth positions to score 31.82% and 9.09% respectively there.

In sum, the post-test results of the treatment group indicated that this group began, as a result of explicit instruction, to approach the American native-like manipulations in refusing such type of situation. The following examples show a comparison between the treatment pre-and post-tests performance to confirm the development after receiving instructions:

- Subject # 10:

• **Pre-test response:**

Thank you, I dislike the tea.

• **Post-test response:**

That’s very kind of you, but sorry. I don’t like to have a cup of tea. I have to study now.

- Subject # 4:

• **Pre-test response:**

I don’t drink tea.

• **Post-test response:**

That’s very kind of you, but I’m sorry, I don’t like tea, I already had one.

- Subject # 5:

• **Pre-test response:**

No, thank you, I didn’t want.

• **Post-test response:**

That’s a good idea, but I’m sorry, I can’t, I have to write a message now.

Furthermore, Table (5) again shows a quantitative analysis related to the control group. Thus, this group showed no difference in the total number of the strategies per positions scored in the three

DCTs which, in turn, read as follows: 22, 17, 1 in the Arabic test; 22, 19, 3 in the pre-test and 22, 20, 5 in the post-test.

However, the treatment group have increased the number of strategies per positions being more aware of the American semantic formula conducted in such situation. As the table illustrates, the Arabic and the pre-tests show identical results; i.e., 22, 19, 4 vs. 22, 22, 8 as an evidence of PT; whereas the post-test showed an increase in the total number of strategies per positions; i.e. 22, 22, 19, 8, 2 managed in 5 sets. This rise definitely came as an outcome of explicit instructions.

T-TEST

Having finished the aforementioned quantitative and qualitative analyses of each situation in the three DCTs independently, the next step was to apply a parametric statistical T-test on the degrees scored in the two treatments ; that is, before and after the instructional sessions took place. This T-test was conducted in order to see whether the differences in the mean scores detected between the pre- and the post-tests of each group separately are statistically significant or non-significant.

The first paired T-test was conducted on the treatment pre- and post-tests' degrees to gauge whether or not the difference in the two tests is statistically significant as Table (6) below illustrates.

Table (6): Treatment Group’s T-Test: Pre- vs. Post-Tests.

SIT. #	status differentials	Speech act eliciting refusals	Test type	N	X	Sd	Xd	Sdd	N	T	T
1	ST.HIGH	OFFER	pre-test	22	1.91	0.63	0.113	0.596	21	0.893	1.172
			post-test	22	1.80	0.40					
2	ST.LOW	OFFER	pre-test	22	1.86	0.71	-0.159	0.917	21	0.812	
			post-test	22	2.02	0.66					
3	ST.EQUAL	OFFER	pre-test	22	1.73	0.57	-0.181	0.682	21	1.150	
			post-test	22	1.91	0.29					
4	DIS.EQUAL	OFFER	pre-test	22	1.97	0.24	4.555	0.554	21	0.385	
			post-test	22	2.02	0.49					

Concentrating on Sit. #3, for instance and as the table reveals, the computed t-value resulted from the comparison between the pre- and post-tests’ mean scores; i.e. 2.25 and 4.52 under 21 degree of freedom (df) at 0.05 level of significance is 16.408, which is the highest computed T-value among all; whereas the tabulated t-value at identical level reads 1.721. Thus, since the computed T-value obtained is greater than the tabulated T-value, the difference between the pre- and post-tests mean scores is thus statistically significant. Consequently, this indicates that the treatment group proved to be communicatively developed after being explicitly instructed.

Similarly, since all the remaining situations revealed a computed T-value resulted from the comparison between the two tests mean scores greater than the fixed tabulated T-value; i.e. 1.721, under 21 df; the difference between each situation’s pre- and post-tests mean scores is statistically significant. This implies that the treatment subjects’ performance was positively changed and pragmatically developed. Overall, all of the differences between the treatment pre- and post-tests mean scores were statistically significant. These findings undoubtedly are in line with, and greatly

correspond to the previous qualitative and quantitative findings obtained in the previously mentioned studies. Accordingly, the explicit instructions did significantly affect the treatment subjects' L2 pragmatic performance towards the positive change.

The second 'paired T-test' was conducted between the control group's degrees in both the pre- and the post-tests. The aim of this T-test was also to check the differences between the mean scores calculated from these two tests to see whether it is significant or non-significant. Table (7) below shows the results of the 'paired T-test' on control's management in all the two DCTs' situations.

SIT. #	Status differentials	Speech act eliciting refusals	Test type	N	X	Sd	Xd	Sdd	N	T	Sig	T
1	ST.HIGH	OFFER	pre-test	22	2.05	0.67	-1.909	0.854	21	10.484	0.000	1.172
			post-test	22	3.95	0.49						
2	ST.LOW	OFFER	pre-test	22	1.64	0.60	-2.454	0.998	21	11.525	0.000	
			post-test	22	4.09	0.75						
3	ST.EQUAL	OFFER	pre-test	22	2.25	0.48	-2.272	0.649	21	16.408	0.000	
			post-test	22	4.52	0.55						
4	DIS.EQUAL	OFFER	pre-test	22	2.00	0.61	2.386	0.962	21	11.626	0.000	
			post-test	22	4.38	0.77						

Table (7): Control Group's T-Test: pre- vs. post-tests.

Concentrating, for instance, on Sit. #3 in this table, the mean scores obtained for the pre- and the post-tests' degrees are 1.73 and 1.91 respectively. Thus, the difference between these two means scores reads 1.150 representing, in turn, the computed T-value. On checking this T-value under the df 21 at 0.05 level of significance against the tabulated T-value of 1.721 at the same level, the result reveals that the latter T-value was greater than the statistically

obtained one. These findings denote that the difference between the two tests in Sit. # 3 was not significant and that the control subjects showed no development since no refusal instruction was given to this group.

Similarly, a clear examination of the previously mentioned table revealed that the whole computed T-value for the whole situations were less than the tabulated T-value 1.721 under df 21 at 0.05 level of significance. In other words, the lowest computed T-value in Table (7) was that of Sit. #4 (a refusal to equal-distance offer) scoring 0.385.

Accordingly, the difference between the control's two tests performance was not significant. These findings, therefore, are in line with the previously mentioned qualitative and quantitative analyses related to the control's responses. This suggests that both control group's performance in the two tests were somehow homogenous in terms of their pragmatic comprehension of refusals. Consequently, this homogeneity is definitely an outcome of PT from their NL as their only pragmatic knowledge resource since they were not aware of how the L2 refusal is pragmalinguistically and sociopragmatically manipulated.

CONCLUSIONS

In the light of the results obtained, in relation to the present study's hypotheses posed as well as the questions raised, it is empirically confirmed that the L2 PC of the treatment subjects submitted to refusal instructional sessions has been developed and thus got enhanced through the explicit instruction procedure conducted.

The results obtained also reveal that there is a great influence of the subjects' L1 concept on the L2 refusal production detected in

the content, the order and the number of sets used in the semantic formulas implemented.

In addition, the explicit instruction results have positive outcome perceived in the treatment subjects' tendencies towards more polite behavior and longitudinal refusal expressions in their post-test realizations. This positive outcome represented by the improvement of the treatment subjects' ILP stage are greatly in line with those of Tateyama's (2001).

The results from the present study have also shown that the subjects receiving explicit instructions on refusals significantly increased their strategies appropriate to L2 refusals after being submitted to excessive pragmatic instructions unlike the control group which deliberately received no such instruction; and thereby showed no improvement in their post-test responses.

Additionally, the treatment subjects involved in role-playing during the instructional sessions began to be aware of the cross-cultural differences in the social variables that govern the manipulations of the pragmalinguistic components of refusals. This awareness was furthermore culminated in their post-test responses and in the success average calculated and in the T-test results obtained. Thus, the findings reveal that the treatment group had a higher pragmatic awareness after having been instructed than the control group that showed no evidence of improvement.

Accordingly , Iraqi FL learners at college level are certainly in need of pragmatic instruction. Even if they generally know how to perform L2 refusals in a given situation, the strategies they use to reach the goals are often inappropriate and might lead to the breakdown of communication.

BIBLIOGRAGHY

- Bardovi-Harlig, K. & Mahan-Taylor, R. (2003). "Teaching Pragmatics". Washington DC: U.S. Available on online at: <http://exchanges.state.gov/education/engteaching/pragmatics.htm>
- Canale, M. and Swain, M. (1980). "Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing". **Applied Linguistics**, 1: pp.1-47.
- Eslami-Rasekh, Zohreh et al. (2004). "The Effect of Explicit Metapragmatic Instruction on the Speech Act Awareness of Advanced EFL Students". **Teaching English as a Second and a Foreign Language**, vol.8, No.2.
- Hussein, Kamal Hazim (2003). Strategies of Refusals in Arabic with Reference to English. Unpublished (PhD. thesis). University of Mosul.
- Kasper, G. (1997). "Can Pragmatic Competence be Taught?". **Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center**, University of Hawaii. Available on online at: <http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW06/>
- King, K. A., & Silver, R. E. (1993). "Sticking Points: Effects of Instruction on NNS Refusal Strategies". Working Papers in **Educational Linguistics**. vol.9: pp.1-36.
- Kondo, Sachiko (2001). "Instructional Effects on Pragmatic Development: Interlanguage Refusal". Paper presented at Pac SLRF at University of Hawai'i, Manoa.
- Nguyen, Minh Thi Thuy (2005). Criticizing and Responding to Criticism in a Foreign Language: A Study of Vietnamese

- Learners of English. Unpublished (PhD. thesis). The University of Auckland.
- Rose, K., & Kasper, G. (2001). *Pragmatics in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Safont Jordà, M.P. (2004). "An Analysis on EAP Learners' Pragmatic Production: a Focus on Request Forms". **Iberica**, vol.8: pp.23-39.
- Silva, Antonio Jose Bacelar (2003). "The Effects Of Instruction On Pragmatic Development: Teaching Polite Refusals In English". **Second Language Studies**, vol.22, No.(1): pp.55-106.
- Takimoto, Mashahiro (2006). "The Effect of Explicit Feedback on the Development of Pragmatic Proficiency". **Language Teaching Research**. Available on online at:
<http://ltr.sagepub.com/egi/cotent/abstract/14/4/393>
- Witten, Caryn Marie (2002). *The Effects of Input Enhancement and Interactive Video Viewing on the Development of Pragmatic Awareness and Use in the Beginning Spanish L2 Classroom*. Unpublished (Ph.D. thesis). The University of Texas, Austin. Available on online at:
www.asian-efl-journal.com/Thesis_section_2006.pdf
- Yoshimi, D. (2001). "Explicit Instruction and JFL Learners' Use of International Discourse Markers". In Rose & Kasper (eds.). **Pragmatic in Language Teaching**. Cambridge University Press: pp.223-244.

APPENDICES
APPENDIX (A) Arabic-Test

الاسم:
الجنس:
الشعبية:
العمر:
عدد سنوات الدراسة:

عزيزي الطالب : أرجو الاجابة على جميع المواقف التالية برفض الامور المطلوبة منك في كل موقف من المواقف .يرجى الاجابة عليها بشكل طبيعي جدا كما لو انك فعلا قد تعرضت لهذا الموقف في حياتك اليومية. يرجى الاجابة في الفراغ الموجود بعد كلمة اقول في كل موقف.

1- عرض عليك احد مدرسيك أن يوصلك بعد أنتهاء الدوام الى باب الجامعة والسماء تمطر مطرا غزيرا، لكنك تعلم أن طريقه غير طريقك .كيف ترفض عرضه؟
اقول.....

2- قدم لك منظم الكلية كوبا من الشاي، كيف ترفض عرضه؟
اقول.....

3- قدم لك زميلك قطعة حلوى، كيف ترفض عرضه؟
اقول.....

4- قدم لك اخوك كوبا من الشاي، كيف ترفض عرضه؟
اقول.....

نقرأ على مشاركتك.

APPENDIX (B)
English Pre- & Post-Tests DCT

Name: Age:.....
Class: Years of studying English:.....
Gender(male/female):.....

Instructions: Please read the following situations. After each situation, you will be asked to write a response in the blank after the word "You" refusing the things being displayed. Don't spend a lot of time thinking about what answer you think you should provide; instead, please respond as much naturally as possible, and try to write your refusals as you feel you should say it in such situation. Please don't miss anyone and answer them all. Thank you for in advance.

Situation 1 :You have already finished a lecture and are going home. It starts raining heavily. You start running fast to reach the gate. Suddenly, a car stops. It is your

Professor. He offers to give you a ride to the University gate but you know that he usually goes out of the gate opposite to yours. *You refuse saying:*

You : -----

Situation 2: Your Dept. cleaner offers you a cup of tea. *You refuse saying:*

You : -----

Situation 3: Your brother offers you a cup of tea. *You refuse saying:*

You : -----

Situation 4: Your classmate offers you a piece of candy. *You refuse saying:*

You : -----

Thank you for your participation

APPENDIX (C) Semantic Sets of Refusals

I. Direct:

A. **Performative** (e.g., “ I refuse”)

B. **Nonperformative statement**

1. “No”

2. **Negative willingness/ ability(NA)** (“I can’t”. “I won’t”. “I don’t think so”.)

II. Indirect:

A. **Statement of regret** (e.g., “I’m sorry...”; “I feel terrible...”)

B. **Wish** (e.g., “I wish I could help you...”)

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

D. Statement of alternative

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

E. Set condition for future or past acceptance (e.g., “If you had asked me earlier, I would have...”)

F. Promise of future acceptance (e.g., “I'll do it next time”; “I promise I'll...” or “Next time I'll...”-using “will” of promise or “promise”)

G. Statement of principle (e.g., “I never do business with friends.”)

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

I. Attempt to dissuade interlocutor

1. **Threat or statement of negative** consequences to the request (I won't be any fun tonight” to refuse an invitation)

2. **Guilt trip** (e.g., Waitress to costumers who want to sit a while: I can't make a living of people who just offer coffee.”)

3. **Criticize request/requester**, etc. (statement of negative feeling or opinion);

4. **Request for help, empathy, and assistance** by dropping or holding the request.

5. **Let interlocutor off the hook** (e.g., “Don't worry about it.” “That's okay.” “You don't have to.”)

6. **Self defense** (e.g., “I'm trying my best.” “I'm doing all I can do.” “ I no do nutting wrong.”)

J. Acceptance that functions as a refusal:

1. **Unspecific or indefinite reply**

2. **Lack of enthusiasm**

K. Avoidance

1. Nonverbal

- a. **Silence**
- b. **Hesitation.**
- c. **Do nothing**
- d. **Physical departure**

2. Verbal

- a. **Topic switch**
- b. **Joke**
- c. **Repetition of part of request**, etc. (e.g., “Monday?”)
- d. **Postponement** (e.g., “I’ll think about it.”)
- e. **Hedging** (e.g., “Gee, I don’t know.” “I’m not sure.”)

III. Adjuncts to Refusals:

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

Adapted from: Beebe, L. M., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). *Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals*. In R. C. Scarcella, E. Andersen, & S. D. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 55-73). New York: Newbury House cited in Silva, 2003.