The Effects of Implicit vs. Explicit Instruction on Pragmatic Development: Teaching Polite Refusals in English

Eylem Ülbeği

İzmit 28 Haziran İlköğretim Okulu
eylem_yesilyurt@hotmail.com

Özet. Bu çalışma ilk olarak eğitimin ikinci dile ilişkin edimbilimsel gelişim üzerinde kolaylaştırıcı etkisinin olup olmadığını, ikinci olarak ise, bir yabancı dil sınıfında kullanılan eğitim yönteminin (dolaylı ya da doğrudan) öğrencilerin edimbilimsel gelişimini anlamlı bir şekilde etkileyip etkilemediğini incelemektedir. Ön, son ve geciktirilmiş son test tasarımıyla gerçekleştirilmiş ve bir kontrol grup içeren bu çalışma, bir grup Türk ilköğretim okulu sekizinci sınıf öğrencisine Amerikan İngilizcesi'ndeki kibar geri çevirme stratejilerini öğretmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Nicel ve nitel analizlerden elde edilen sonuçlar, doğrudan ve dolaylı öğretimin her ikisinin de öğrencilerin İngilizce'deki kibar geri çevirme stratejilerini öğrenmelerine yardımcı olduğunu göstermekle beraber, doğrudan öğretimin dolaylı öğretime nispeten daha olumlu bir etkisinin olduğu hipotezini desteklemektedir. Sonuçlardan aynı zamanda eğitimin tanımsal bilgiyi, üretken bilgiden daha çok geliştirdiği yargısına da ulaşılabilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: kibarlık, kibar geri çevirme, ikinci dil edimbilimsel edinim/öğrenim, dolaylılık.

Abstract. The present study explores initially whether instruction may facilitate the L2 pragmatic development, and secondly, whether the type of instruction (implicit vs. explicit) given in a second language classroom

context significantly affects learners' pragmatic learning. In a pre-test/post-test design, including a delayed post-test, with a control group, this study aimed to teach polite refusals in American English to a group of 8th grade Turkish primary school students. Results from both qualitative and quantitative analysis indicate that although both implicit and explicit instruction help the pupils to learn polite refusals in English, implicit instruction has a significiantly better effect than explicit instruction. We can also infer from the results that instruction facilitates receptive knowledge more than productive knowledge.

Key Words: politeness, polite refusals, L2 pragmatic acquisition/learning, indirectness.

INTRODUCTION

Kasper & Rose (2002) consider the ability to recognize the appropriateness of an utterance within a given context and to choose one possible form over another based on that understanding, one of the most important skills associated with pragmatic competence. It has been observed that L2 learners display a noticeably different L2 pragmatic system than the native speakers of the L2, both in production and comprehension (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; Kasper, 1997). This is mostly caused by learners' notion of transferability. Kasper & Schmidt (1996) have explained it in two terms: One is the possibility of the learners' hesitation of transfering the L1 strategies that may be universal or at least common to L2, and the other is transfering strategies, assuming them to be universal, thus transferable, when actually it is not the case. In line with this perspective, I would argue that even advanced learners' utterances may contain pragmatic errors. For these reasons I assume that instruction on L2 pragmatics is necessary at every level of proficiency to develop learners' pragmatic competence and performance.

Linguists have been debating on politeness phenomena for a very long time but the study on the acquisition/learning of L2 pragmatic system has a shorter history; however, even this limited number of studies demonstrates that it is possible to acquire L2 pragmatic knowledge through instruction.

This interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) study focuses on the acquisition of polite refusals in a second language classroom context. More specifically, it investigates the effects of implicit vs explicit instruction on the development of L2 pragmatic ability to interpret and produce these refusals by learners of English as a second language.

Since "the indirect act of refusing" is considered as a politeness strategy, this paper will initially review the notion of politeness phenomenon and indirectness.

Literature Revıew

The Notion of Politeness and Indirectness

People do not always say exactly what they mean. They rather hint at what they would like to mean. They try to get an idea of what the other person might think of what they might mean, and be ready to adjust or take back what they might have meant (Tannen 1985; Holtgraves 1998). McQuiddy (as cited in Cheng, 2003) points out that indirectness in conversations is a way of conveying desired messages by means of an interrelationship of social variables and linguistic content. This paper initially explores the various aspects of indirectness in conversational discourse. The notion of indirectness is examined through Ervin Goffman's theory of face and Brown & Levinson's application of the theory of face to politeness phenomenon.

Ervin Goffman's theory of face in human interaction explains why we say things indirectly. According to Goffman (1967), face, or one's public identity, is a "sacred thing" that is always at stake when interacting with others. Because of this, people are strongly motivated to protect and manage their face (Holtgraves, 2005). Based on Gofman's notion of face, Brown & Levinson (1978, 1987) propose that face as a public self-image is composed of two specific face-wants: positive and negative face. They point out that negative face is the desire to interact without being impeded by others. It represents the desire for autonomy. Positive face is related to the want to be approved of by other people. It is associated with one's desire for approval. Overall, then, politeness, as face-work, provides an important and overarching framework for capturing the manner in which the fundamental social psychological construct of face is linguistically (and nonlinguistically) realized and how it plays out during the course of a social interaction. (Holtgraves, 2005).

After examining the notion of politeness and indirectness in a general sense, this study will review the theoretical background and previous research on teaching polite refusals.

Theoretical Background and Previous Research:

Comparative Effects of Implicit vs. Explicit Instruction on Teaching L2 Pragmatics

Communicating effectively and efficiently in any language requires not only linguistic knowledge but also the ability to use this knowledge appropriately. Pragmatic competence has been regarded as one of the main components of communicative competence (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995). An important area in the field of second/foreign language teaching and learning, for this reason, is pragmatics - the study of *inferred* meaning. Despite this fact, most of the studies in interlanguage pragmatics are comparative or contrastive in nature and focus on communication rather than learning with some exceptions listed below:

Figure 1. Instructed L2 pragmatic acquisition studies to date

Directives	Scarcella and Brunak (1981)
Apologies	Olshtain and Blum-Kulka (1985), Trosborg (1986), Olshtain and Cohen (1993)
Requests	LoCastro (1997), Fukuya & Clark (2001), Takahashi (2001) Fukuya & Zhang (2002), Safont (2003) and Salazar (2003)
Pragmatic routines	Wildner- Bassett (1994), House (1996), Tateyama, et al.(1997), Tateyama (2001), Yoshimi (2001) and Kim & Hall (2002)
Implicatures	Bouton (1994) and Kubota (1995)
address forms	Belz & Kinginger (2003)
Compliments	Billmyer (1990), LoCastro (2000), and Rose & Ng Kwai-fun (2001)
suggestions	Martínez-Flor & Fukuya (2005)
Socio-stylistic variation	Lyster (1994)
Hedges in academic writing	Wishnoff (2000)
Interactional norms	Liddicoat & Crozet (2001), Davies (2004)
Refusals	King & Silver (1993), Morrow (1996), Kondo (2001), Silva (2003)

The majority of literature on the instructed L2 pragmatic acquisition demonstrate that students clearly profited from the instruction provided (e.g. Wildner-Bassett, 1984; Olshtain and Cohen, 1990; Billmyer, 1990a,b; Bouton, 1994a; House, 1996; Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; Liddicoat and Crozet, 2001). Tateyama (2001; Tateyama et al., 1997) found similar results with these studies. His studies show that short pragmatic routines are teachable to absolute beginners. Safont's (2003) work on request modification, also supports Tateyama's results indicating that pragmatics can be learned before students begin to analyze second language knowledge. However, in some of these studies, participants showed little (Takahashi, 2001; Rose and Ng, 2001) or no (Fukuya and Clark, 2001) improvement. Fukuya and Clark

(2001) found no significant difference between treatment and control groups. In addition, in some research (Kubota, 1995; Salazar, 2003) instruction had very short-lived effects and initial gains had disappeared by the time of delayed post-tests.

Another central issue discussed extensively in the recent literature on the teaching of L2 pragmatic knowledge is the teaching approaches used in instructions. In a fair amount of research, learners who received explicit instruction outperformed implicit learners (e.g. Tateyama, et al. ,1997; Rose & Ng, 2001; Wildner-Bassett, 1984, 1986; House, 1996). Norris and Ortega (2000) synthesising the role of instruction on various linguistic features conducted between the years of 1980 and 1998, also offer a clear advantage of explicit over implicit instruction. Although Kasper and Rose (1999) suggest explicit instruction yields better results than implicit teaching, they also found it worthy to note that explicit teaching is helpful for consciousness raising, but it may be less effective for some aspects of skill development. Support for implicit teaching can also be found in several studies. Kubota (as cited in Rose, 2005) in his replication of Bouton's study on implicature comprehension found that learners who received implicit instruction outperformed those in an explicit group; however these differences had disappeared by the time of delayed post-test. Furthermore, Korean children developed successful discourse management strategies and pragmatic formulas despite a lack of any explicit instruction in Kim & Hall's (2002) study. Finally, it should also be noted that there are also studies in which there were no significant differences across treatment groups (e.g. Fukuya and Clark, 2001; Tateyama, 2001 and Martínez-Flor & Fukuya, 2005).

From this brief consideration of the studies on the subject, we can draw two conclusions. Firstly, although there is little evidence against it, the results of these studies are mostly encouraging and indicate that most pragmatic features are indeed teachable. Secondly, in teaching these features, explicit instruction seems to be more facilitative than implicit teaching. However, care must be taken in interpreting the results of these studies. Firstly, many researchers report only statistically significant test results, they do not always report insignificant results. Secondly, not all studies include a control group and this makes it difficult to compare the results of the study. Despite these deficiencies, from these studies we are able to understand that instruction - no matter explicit or implicit - has a positive effect on learners' pragmatic competence.

Teaching Polite Refusals

Refusals are found in four types of exchanges, namely those involving invitation-refusals, request-refusals, offer-refusals and suggestion-refusals (Barron, 2003). As mentioned earlier, the main concerns of the present study are refusals of invitations and requests. Prior to the study, I will briefly revisit earlier work on the present subject. To my knowledge, studies that have searched for evidence of the effect of instruction on learners' acquisition of polite refusal strategies are few in number.

In a pre-test/post-test treatment and control group design, King and Silver (1993) taught polite refusal strategies to six intermediate level learners of ESL (four native speakers of Japanese, one of Spanish and one of Greek). The control group did not receive any instruction. For assessment the study used a discourse completion questionnaire as pre-test and post test. Telephone talks were also used as delayed post-test. The results showed little effect of instruction on the written post-test and no effect on the delayed post-test.

An explicit approach (metapragmatic judgment tasks, model dialogs, explanation of the semantic formulas, games, controlled output practice and role-plays) was adopted by Morrow (as cited in Silva, 2003) to investigate the effect of instruction on learners' production of refusal and complaint speech acts. After a pre-test, the subjects received a three-hours and thirty minutes instruction. They were given a post-test just after the instuction and a delayed post-test six months later. The study did not include a control group. The data taken from the role-plays were analyzed using holistic ratings of clarity and politeness and compared with those of native English speakers. The findings of the study suggest a significant effect of instruction on both clarity and politeness. However, initial gains had disappeared by the time of post-tests. But the researcher notes that because of the smaller number of participants who came for the post-test, carried out six months after the treatment and the possibility of naturalistic learning happening between post-tests, he could not assess whether the gains were maintained up to post-test.

In a pre-test/post-test design without a control group, Kondo (as cited in Silva, 2003) taught polite refusal in English to thirty-five Japanese learners of English (TOEIC average equaled 303). Both implicit and explicit instruction using models, explicit explanation, analysis of semantic formulas, controlled/free practice and cross-cultural comparison, followed by a discussion were given to the participants. For assessment the study administered a discourse completion questionnaire as pre-test and post-test,

as in the study of King and Silver (1993). Results showed a significant effect of instruction given but, even after instruction, the Japanese learners of English retained some characteristics of their pragmatic behaviour which they strongly preferred in the L1: Statements of regret, though approximating American English speakers, was still more frequent among Japanese learners of English.

In a pre-test/post-test treatment and control group design, Silva (2003) taught fourteen low intermediate learners from various L1s (Japanese, Chinese, Taiwanese, Serbian, and Portuguese). This study was set up to further investigate whether relatively explicit instruction may be facilitative for L2 pragmatic development, and the most appropriate and effective ways to deliver the pragmatic information to L2 learners. The subjects were randomly assigned to both the control (7) and treatment (7) groups. Data, collected by means of role-play, was transcribed, and a qualitative discourse analytic approach was used to examine the learning outcomes in the treatment group as compared to the control group. The results of the study indicated that the instruction given enhanced the L2 pragmatic ability of performing the speech act in focus.

This brief review of the studies provides an insight into the question of whether instruction is facilitative for teaching polite refusals. King and Silver (1993) reported that the instruction given in their study had little effect and Morrow (1996) noted that instruction had a significant effect. However, in both studies the results showed no effect on the delayed post-tests. Kondo (2001) also noted the importance of instruction. Though, he also mentioned that the Japanese learners of English continued to use some characteristics of their pragmatic behaviour which they prefer in the L1. Silva's (2003) study indicated that the instruction given enhanced the L2 pragmatic ability.

After examining the previous research on the subject, the present study takes the refusals of invitations and requests as its central concern.

METHOD

Research Question: In acquiring polite refusals in English,

1) Can instruction be facilitative? If so,

2) Does the type of instruction (implicit vs. explicit) given in a second language classroom context significantly affect the learners' ability to interpret and produce these refusals?

Participants

Subjects in this study consist of 60 8th grade students from İsabey Yüksel Bodur Primary School in Gürsu, Bursa, of which 33 are girls and 27 are boys. They are divided into three groups: First treatment group, second treatment group, and control group. They are all non-native speakers of English, identified as having approximately the same level of proficiency in the target language. At the time of data collection, the students were receiving 4 hours of English per week. The age of the participants ranged from 13 to 15. The demographic information about these participants is summarized in Appendix A.

Procedures

This study adopted a pre-test/post-test design, including a delayed post-test with a control group. Prior to the study, learners in both the treatment groups and the control group were asked to fill out a personal information sheet to elicit demographic information. They were also provided with general information about the research procedures.

Learners in the first treatment group received implicit instruction on refusals in English (see Appendix B). Learners in the second treatment group were presented with four video segments, two of which depicted invitation/ refusal and the other two depicted request/ refusal events that had been recorded for the sake of this research and simulated the dialogues in the video segments. The instruction given to the first treatment group took two course hours (40+40= 80 minutes). The one given to the second treatment group (see Appendix C) took three course hours (40+40+40= 120 minutes). The simulations done by all of the students required an extra lesson time. The control group did not receive any instruction on the target feature.

Assessment Instruments and Procedures

Instruction in both the first and second treatment groups was preceded by a pre-test (see Appendix D) and immediately followed by a post-test (see Appendix D) -a delayed post-test was administered after a month- including exactly the same questions. The first part of the test was prepared to assess the productive use and the second part of the test was prepared to assess the receptive knowledge of polite refusals in English - both parts including 6 situations in L1. The students were asked to refuse the invitations or requests politely in the given situations in the target language. The two parts (one productive and one receptive) were given separately in order to avoid the effect of reception test on the production test. The control group received just the pre-test.

Data Analysis

In order to find out to what extent learners have developed skills for refusing invitation or request after instruction, a detailed analysis of the student answers given to the situations in order to assess both their receptive and productive knowledge was conducted. The students' answers were checked and the appropriate answers were counted in both the pre-tests and post-tests. Then, the results were compared quantitatively. Lastly, the answers were analyzed one by one. The answers that were pragmatically appropriate but grammatically not were considered to be appropriate, since the aim of these tests was to assess learners' performance of refusals, not grammatical knowledge.

DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

Quantitative analysis of the pre-tests and the post-tests

First a statistical analysis was performed on data collected from the 3 groups. The results of the survey were computed using SPSS in terms of frequency and percentage.

Pre-test Results

Table 1. 1st treatment group pre-test results (receptive part)

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	2	3	15,0
	3	8	40,0
	4	8	40,0
	5	1	5,0
	Total	20	100,0

The results of the receptive part of the first treatment group's pre-tests are detailed in Table 1. None of the 20 participants selected the appropriate answer for all 6 items. 3 participants answered 2 items, 8 participants answered 3 items, 8 answered 4 items, and just 1 answered 5 items appropriately.

Table 2. 1st treatment group pre-test results (productive part)

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	0	17	85,0
	2	1	5,0
	4	2	10,0
	Total	20	100,0

The findings of the productive part of the first treatment group's pre-tests are summarized in Table 2. 17 of the participants gave an appropriate answer to none of the items. 2 participants answered 4 items, and just 1 participant answered 2 items appropriately. However, we should bear in mind that the 3 learners' answers which are considered to be appropriate were pragmatically appropriate but grammatically incorrect.

Table 3. 2nd treatment group pre-test results (receptive part)

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	2	3	15,0
	3	9	45,0
	4	7	35,0
	5	1	5,0
	Total	20	100,0

Table 3 presents the details of the results of the receptive part of the second treatment group's pre-tests. Among the 6 items, 3 participants selected the appropriate answer for 2 items, 9 participants for 3 items, 7 for 4 items, and just 1 for 5 items. None of them prefered appropriate answers for all the items in the receptive part of the test.

Table 4. 2nd treatment group pre-test results (productive part)

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	0	18	90,0
	2	1	5,0
	3	1	5,0
	Total	20	100,0

When the second treatment group's answers were examined (Table 4), it was seen that 18 of the students could produce an appropriate answer to none of the items, just 1 student gave an appropriate answer to 3 items and another student to 2 items.

Table 5. Control group pre-test results (receptive part)

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	1	2	10,0
	2	3	15,0
	3	4	20,0
	4	9	45,0
	5	2	10,0
	Total	20	100,0

The same pre-test was administered to the control group. Table 5 shows that among 20 participants, 2 selected the appropriate answer for 1 item, 3 for 2 items, 4 for 3 items, 9 for 4 items and 2 for 5 items. None of them could have chosen the most appropriate answer for all the items in the test.

Table 6. Control group pre-test results (productive part)

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	0	16	80,0
	1	1	5,0
	2	2	10,0
	4	1	5,0
	Total	20	100,0

Table 6 presents the details of the results of the productive part of the control group's pre-tests. The findings point out that 16 of the participants in the control group answered none of the items appropriately, just 1 participant gave an appropriate answer to 1 item, 2 to 2 items and 1 to 4 items.

Results indicate that none of the students could perform an appropriate answer for all the questions in the receptive part; and 85% of the students in the first treatment group, 90% of the students in the second treatment group and 80% of the students in the control group could answer none of the

questions in the productive part of the pre-test appropriately. However, care must be taken in interpreting these results, since the participants' appropriate answers in the reception parts can be coincidence. On the other hand, approximately the same results amongst the groups show us that the groups are alike in the proficiency level.

Post-test Results

Table 7. 1st treatment group post-test results (receptive part)

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	3	2	10,0
	4	5	25,0
	5	7	35,0
	6	6	30,0
	Total	20	100,0

When the first treatment group's post-test results are examined (Table 7) it is seen that 2 of the participants answered 3 items, 5 participants answered 4 items, 7 answered 5 items, and 6 answered 6 items appropriately in the test. It is clearly seen that many of the students (90%) could select the appropriate answer for at least 4 items. The remaining 2 answered 3.

Table 8. 1st treatment group post-test results (productive part)

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	0	1	5,0
	2	4	20,0
	4	3	15,0
	5	2	10,0
	6	10	50,0
	Total	20	100,0

Table 8 shows that just 1 participant who received implicit instruction, could not answer any of the items appropriately in the first treatment group. 75% answered at least 4 items. Half of the learners answered all of the questions in an appropriate way.

338

Table 9. 2nd treatment group post-test results (receptive part)

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	2	2	10,0
	3	3	15,0
	4	3	15,0
	5	7	35,0
	6	5	25,0
	Total	20	100,0

When the second treatment group's post-test results are examined (Table 9) it reveals that 2 of the learners gave appropriate answers to 2 items, 3 participants answered 3 items, 3 answered 4 items, 7 answered 5 items, and 5 answered 6 items in an appropriate way. It is seen that 75% of the students could select an appropriate answer for at least 4 questions in the receptive part of the post-test.

Table 10. 2nd treatment group post-test results (productive part)

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	0	1	5,0
	2	6	30,0
	4	3	15,0
	5	3	15,0
	6	7	35,0
	Total	20	100,0

Table 10 demonstrates that just 1 student who received explicit instruction, could not answer any of the questions in the second treatment group. 65% answered at least 4 questions in the productive part of the test appropriately.

Comparisons between the receptive and productive parts

When the first treatment group's post-test answers are explored it is seen that while 90% of the participants answered at least 4 items in the receptive part appropriately (Table 8) , 75% gave appropriate answers to 4 or more than 4 items in the productive part (Table 9). No participants could answer at least 2 of the items in the receptive part, but there was 1 who could answer none of the items in the productive part.

When we look into the answers of the second treatment group we see that 75% of the learners answered at least 4 items in the receptive part of the test appropriately (Table 10), while 65% answered 4 or more than 4 items in the productive part in an appropriate way (Table 11).

The pre-test results of the control group also show that the participants performed better in the productive part of the tests (55% to 5%).

These results clearly indicate that participants in all 3 groups have done better in the receptive parts of the tests. That is to say, their receptive knowledge has developed more than their productive knowledge. This indicates that they may find it relatively easier to recognize the utterances given in the test items.

Comparisons Between the pre-tests and post-tests

The influence of classroom instruction could be better observed when pre-test and post-test results are compared.

Table 11. 1st treatment group pre-test and post-test results in total

Pre-test total		Frequency	Percent	Post-test total		Frequency	Percent
Valid				Valid	5	1	5,0
	2	3	15,0		7	5	25,0
	3	6	30,0		8	2	10,0
	4	8	40,0		9	1	5,0
	5	1	5,0		10	3	15,0
	7	1	5,0		11	4	20,0
	9	1	5,0		12	4	20,0
	Total	20	100,0		Total	20	100,0

While there were just 2 learners who answered more than 6 questions appropriately in the pre-test in the first treatment group, there was only 1 who answered just 5 items in the post-test. 95% answered at least 7 in the post-test. 4 learners answered all the items in an appropriate way _ though with some grammatical errors. When we consider the learners who answered more than half of the questions, the implicit instruction appears to have a profound effect on teaching.

Table 12. 2nd treatment group pre-test and post-test results in total

Pre-test total		Frequency	Percent	Post-test total		Frequency	Percent
Valid				Valid	5	1	5,0
	1	1	5,0		6	5	25,0
	2	3	15,0		7	1	5,0
	3	7	35,0		8	2	10,0
	4	6	30,0		9	1	5,0
	5	1	5,0		10	3	15,0
	7	1	5,0		11	5	25,0
	9	1	5,0		12	3	15,0
	Total	20	100,0		Total	20	100,0

While there were just 2 participants who answered more than 6 items succesfully in the pre-test in the second treatment group, there was only 1 who answered just 5 questions in the post-test. 70% answered at least 7 in the post test. 3 students answered all the questions appropriately. When we consider the students who have answered more than half of the items, the explicit instruction is also likely to have a pronounced effect. That's to say, the findings of the study indicate that both implicit and explicit instruction have helped the learners to acquire polite refusals in English.

Comparisons between the 1st Treatment Group and the 2nd Treatment Group

As was mentioned earlier, many researchers (e.g. Tateyama, et al. ,1997; Rose & Ng, 2001; Wildner-Bassett, 1984, 1986; House, 1996; Kasper and Rose, 1999; Norris and Ortega, 2000; Silva, 2003) have implied that explicit instruction proved to be more effective and have yielded better results than implicit instruction in the teaching of L2 pragmatics. However, the opposite can be inferred from the findings of the present study. Table 11 and Table 12 indicate that implicit instruction has had a significantly better effect on the teaching of polite refusals than explicit instruction.

Comparisons between the Control Group and Treatment Groups

Table 13. Control group pre-test results in total

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	1	2	10,0
	2	2	10,0
	3	4	20,0
	4	8	40,0
	5	4	20,0
	Total	20	100,0

When the results of the control group are compared with the treatment groups' post-test results, it can be seen that there is a significant difference among the groups. While 95% of the participants in the first treatment group and 70% of the participants in the second treatment group answered at least more than half of the questions in the post test, none of the students could meet the critirion of the study. The most successful student in the control group answered 5 questions.

Qualitative analysis of the pre-tests and the post-tests

This study will now look into the answers of the students given in the productive parts of the tests in order to find out the development of the students' productive knowledge.[i]

Pre-test results

Most of the students prefered not to answer the questions in the productive parts of the pre-tests in each group. Some of them either found saying *"sorry"* or *"I'm sorry"* enough to be polite or couldn't manage to form full sentences and just preferred to excuse themselves by saying so. The most approximate answers were those of which were followed by an excuse. There was no hesitation or a positive opinion given in those answers. Here are some examples from those answers:

(1) *I am sorry. I <u>have</u> an exam tomorrow.* (situation 1)

(2) *I <u>have to study</u>.* (situation 1)

(3) *I am sorry. I <u>must</u> prepare homework.* (situation 3)

(4) *I am sorry. I <u>am going to</u> watch TV.* (situation 5)

There was also grammatically inappropriate sentences sharing the same features with the sentences above.

(5) *I am homework to prepare necessary. Other time.[ii]* (situation 3)

(6) *I am sorry <u>because</u> I am very love the clock[iii].* (situation 6)

There was a student who hesitated before giving an excuse, but this could have been the result of the interaction between the students. She could have learnt about the target subject from a school mate.

Post-test Results

Answers in the post-tests were remarkably improved to those given in the pre-tests. The students tended to hesitate before giving an excuse. In addition to this, they mostly tried to give a positive opinion and stated that they feel bad having to refuse. They even used lies when necessary to refuse politely.

Instances of both grammatically and pragmatically appropriate answers

(7) *Uhm, I'd like to. Sorry, <u>but I have to</u> study for an exam tomorrow.* (situation 1)

(8) *Uhm, I'd like to <u>but</u>, I'm sorry, I will use it myself.* (situation 2)

(9) *Gee, I don't know, I'd like to <u>but</u> I am sorry, I feel ill.* (situation 3)

(10) *Uhh, that's a good idea, <u>but</u> my father doesn't give permission.* (situation 4)

(11) *Well, I'd like to <u>but</u> my aunt is coming over tonight.* (situation 4)

(12) *Uhm, I'd love to, <u>but</u> I am sorry, I <u>must</u> help my mother.* (situation 5)

(13) *Gee, I don't know, I'd like to, <u>but</u> I feel tired.* (situation 5)

(14) *Uhh, I'm not sure, I'd like to, <u>but</u> I broke it yesterday.* (situation 6)

Most of the students not only have learnt how to refuse politely but also to give excuse in a grammatically correct way. They have mostly used modals like *"have to"*, *"must"* and phrases *"I am going to"*, *"I was going to"* while giving excuses; they learnt how to use *"but"* to give excuse.

There was also inappropriate answers given due to students lack of knowledge and vocabulary.

Instances of grammatically incorrect but pragmatically appropriate answers

(15) *Uhm, I'd like to. sorry but I <u>have for</u> an exam tomorrow.* (situation 1)

(16) *Mmm I don't know <u>I myself study</u>.* (situation 1)

(17) *Mmm, I'm sorry today <u>me essential</u>[iv].* (situation 2)

(18) *Mmm, I'd like to but <u>computer broken</u>.* (situation 2)

(19) *Uhm, I'm sorry. I have to prepare homework <u>weekend</u>.* (situation 3)

(20) *Uhm, that's a good idea, but my friend is coming <u>we</u>[v] night.* (situation 4)

(21) *Gee, I don't know today <u>much tired</u>.* (situation 5)

(22) *Uhm, I'd like to. I'm sorry, but <u>memory grandmother it</u>[vi]*. (situation 6)

(23) *Uhm, I'd like to, but it <u>my many valuable</u>[vii]*. (situation 6)

(24) *Uhm, sorry, <u>hour lost</u>[viii]*. (situation 6)

Although instruction has generally been successful there are also learners who have given neither grammatically nor pragmatically appropriate answers to the items even in the post-tests. However, there is little point in mentioning them since the number of them is not enough to affect the influence of the instruction. The interesting point is that the number of these students was higher in the first treatment group who had had implicit instruction and had generally done better in the tests.

CONCLUSION

This study was set up to further investigate whether instruction may be facilitative for the L2 pragmatic development, and if so, whether the type of instruction (implicit vs. explicit) given in a second language classroom context significantly affect learners' abilities to interpret and produce these polite refusals in English. The findings of the study indicate that both implicit and explicit instruction have helped the pupils to learn polite refusals in English. On the other hand, although in a substantial body of research, explicit instruction was proved to be more effective and has yielded better results than implicit instruction in the teaching of L2 pragmatics, the opposite can be inferred from the findings of the present study. The results of this study indicate that implicit instruction has had a significantly better effect on the learning of polite refusals than explicit instruction. This finding is also in line with the findings of some previous studies (e.g. Kubota, 1995; Kim & Hall, 2002).

This paper also attempted to find out whether the receptive or productive knowledge has developed more. It adopted a pre-test/post-test design, including a delayed post-test, with a control group. The tests included both receptive and productive parts in order to elicit info on learners' development of interpreting and producing polite refusals of invitations and

requests. The results indicate that all learners in the 3 groups have done better in the receptive parts of the tests. That is to say, their receptive knowledge seems to have developed more than their productive knowledge. One might interpret this pattern as meaning that it is easier to recognize the utterances given in the test items than to produce them.

This study exhibits that instruction helps pupils to acquire L2 pragmatic knowledge, as it can be inferred from the comparison of the results of pre-tests and post-tests, and control group's answers with treatment groups' answers. However, when the results of the delayed post-tests are considered, it can be seen that revision or frequent use of the target feature plays an important part. The results of the delayed post-tests are somewhat lower than immediate post-test results, but the ratio amongst the groups is similar to the post-tests and delayed post-tests.

There are, of course, many aspects of L2 pragmatic acquisition that I have not mentioned. Exposure to the L2 alone is one of these areas. However, this study's main concern was to examine the receptive and productive practices of polite refusals after instruction. I hope that at least some of what I have said will be of some use for further studies.

REFERENCES

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

Barron, A. 2003. *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics: learning how to do things.* Philadelphia, PA, USA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Billmyer, K., 1990a. I really like your lifestyle: ESL learners learning how to compliment. Penn Working Papers in Educational Linguistics 6 (2), 31–48.

Billmyer, K., 1990b. I really like your lifestyle: ESL learners learning how to compliment. Penn Working Papers in Educational Linguistics 6, 31–48.

Bouton, L.F. (1994a). Can NNS skill in interpreting implicature in American English be improved through explicit instruction? A pilot study. In: L. Bouton & Y. Kachru (Eds), *Pragmatics and Language Learning Monograph Series, vol. 5. Division of English as an International Language* (pp. 88-109). Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois.

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

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

Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative Competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics,* 6, 5-35.

Cheng, W. 2003. *Intercultural Conversation: A Study of Hong Kong Chinese.* Philadelphia, PA, USA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Fukuya, Y., & Clark, M. (2001). A comparison of input enhancement and explicit instruction of mitigators. In: L. Bouton (Ed.) , *Pragmatics and Language Learning, Monograph Series, vol. 10. Division of English as an International Language* (pp. 111-130). Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois.

Goffman, E. 1967. *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-face Behavior.* Garden City, NY: Anchor.

Holtgraves, T. (1998). Interpreting Indirect Replies. *Cognitive Psychology*, 37, 1-27.

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

House, J. (1996). Developing pragmatic fluency in English as a foreign language: Routines and metapragmatic awareness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition 18,* 225-52.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Kubota, M. (1995). Teachability of conversational implicature to Japanese EFL learners. *IRLT Bulletin 9*, 35–67.

Liddicoat, A., & Crozet, C. (2001). Acquiring French interactional norms through instruction. In: K. Rose, & G. Kasper. (Eds.) , *Pragmatics in Language Teaching* (pp. 125-144). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Martı´nez-Flor, A., Fukuya, Y.J. (2005). The effects of instruction on learners production of appropriate and accurate suggestions. *System 33 (3).*

Norris, J., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 50*, 417-528.

Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. (1990). The learning of complex speech act behavior. *TESL Canadan Journal, 7*, 45-65.

Rose, K., & Ng, C. (2001). Inductive and deductive teaching of compliments and compliment responses. In: K. Rose, & G. Kasper. (Eds.) , *Pragmatics in Language Teaching* (pp. 145–170). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, K. R. (2005). On the effects of instruction in second language pragmatics. *System 33,* 385-399.

Safont, M. P. (2003). Instructional effects on the use of request acts modificatoin devices by EFL learners. In: A. Martı´nez-Flor, E. Uso´, & A. Ferna´ndez. (Eds.) , *Pragmatic Competence and Foreign Language Teaching* (pp. 211-232). Spain: Servei de Publicacions de la Universitat Jaume I, Castello´n.

Salazar, P. C. (2003). Pragmatic instruction in the EFL context. In: A. Martı´nez-Flor, E. Uso´, & A. Ferna´ndez. (Eds.) , *Pragmatic Competence and Foreign Language Teaching* (pp. 233-246). Spain: Servei de Publicacions de la Universitat Jaume I, Castello´n.

Silva, A. J. B. (2003). The Effects Of Instruction On Pragmatic Development: Teaching Polite Refusals in English. [PDF document]. University of Hawai'i, Working Papers in Second Language Studies, 22(1), Fall 2003, pp. 55-106. from http://www.hawaii.edu/sls/?link=working_papers.

Takahashi, S. (2001). The role of input enhancement in developing pragmatic competence. In: In: K. Rose, & G. Kasper. (Eds.) , *Pragmatics in Language Teaching* (pp. 171-199). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

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

Tateyama, Y., Kasper, G., Mui, L.P., Tay, H., Thananart, O. (1997). Explicit and implicit teaching of Japanese pragmatics routines. In: L. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and Language Learning, Monograph Series, vol. 8. Division of English as an International Language* (pp. 163-178). Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois.

Wildner-Bassett, M. 1984. *Improving pragmatic aspects of learners' interlanguage: A comparison of methodological approaches for teaching gambits to advanced adult learners of English in industry*. Tubingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Wildner-Bassett, M. (1986). Teaching and learning 'polite noises': Improving pragmatic aspects of advanced adult learners' interlanguage. In: G. Kasper (Ed.), *Learning, teaching, and communication in the foreign language classroom* (pp. 163-177). Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.

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

APPENDIX A

Frequency and percentage of the age & gender of the participants

		First Treatment Group		Second Treatment Group		Control Group		Total	
		frequecy	percentage %	frequecy	percentage %	frequecy	percentage %	f	p %
age	13	1	5	-	0	-	0	1	1,7
	14	15	75	14	70	15	75	44	73,3
	15	4	20	6	30	5	25	15	25
total		20	100	20	100	20	100	60	100
gender	girls	12	60	11	55	10	50	33	55
	boys	8	40	9	45	10	50	27	45
total		20	100	20	100	20	100	60	100

APPENDIX B

Instruction given to the first treatment group[ix]

Saying 'no' in English

First step: Students read the example sentence written on the board:

Phil*: Do you wanna see a movie tomorrow?*

Second step: Students are asked to refuse Phil's invitation.

Third step: The teacher explains to the students that Chris and Phil are Americans and shows the students how Chris refuses Phil's invitation and explains that this example shows what they generally do to say 'no' politely.

> **Phil**: *Do you wanna see a movie tomorrow?*

> **Chris**: *Uhm, I'd like to. Sorry, but I have to study for an exam tomorrow.*

Forth step: The students read the different parts of Chris's response and say what he did to say 'no' politely to Phil. Circle the correct answer.

1. When Chris says '*Uhm'*, he:

    a. gives an excuse   c. says he feels bad

    b. hesitates   d. gives a positive opinion

2. When Chris says '*I'd like to'*, he:

    a. gives an excuse   c. says he feels bad

    b. hesitates   d. gives a positive opinion

3. When Chris says '*Sorry'*, he:

    a. gives an excuse   c. says he feels bad

    b. hesitates   d. gives a positive opinion

4. When Chris says '*but I have to study for an exam tomorrow'*, he:

    a. gives an excuse   c. says he feels bad

    b. hesitates   d. gives a positive opinion

Fifth step: The students look at Chris's response again and they note the sequence of phrases he uses in his response and complete the following statement about how Americans generally say 'no' politely.

Chris: Uhm, I'd like to. Sorry, but I have to study for an exam tomorrow.

First, Americans_____; second, they_____; third, they_____; and then, they _____.

Sixth step: The students read another example, put a check (√) mark next to the things she did in her response and write down the exact part of her response that goes with it on the line provided.

> **Rachel**: *Hey Mon, what are you doing now? Wanna come see a movie with us?*

> **Monica**: *Uhh, y'know I was gonna do some laundry.*

___ hesitates: _____

____say she is sorry: _____

____gives a positive opinion: _____

____gives an excuse: _____

Seventh step: The teacher explains why this example is different from the initial one and emphasizes the importance of "hesitation" and "give excuse" parts since research indicate that these steps are placed in every utterance of native speakers of American English.

Eight Step: Students are provided the necessary information about how to provide refusals such as:

Hesitate: Americans show they are not ready to agree by saying things that show that

they're thinking about what to say.

> *'Mmm' , well, uhm, etc*
>
> *Gee, I don't know.*
>
> *I'm not sure.*
>
> *I don't think I can.*

Show that you feel bad about the situation:

In the beginning :	At the end:
Sorry… *I'm sorry to say that…* *I wish I could, but…* *I really wanted to, but…*	*Sorry about that.*

Give an excuse: Americans usually expect some kind of explanation, specific reasons
for saying no.
I have a headache.
My friend is coming over tonight.
I will use it myself.

APPENDIX C

Instruction given to the second treatment group

Saying 'no' in English

First step: Students watched four video segments that had been recorded for the sake of this research. The transcription of the records:

> ### Record 1
>
> ***Phil****: Do you wanna see a movie tomorrow?*
>
> ***Chris****: Uhm, I'd like to. Sorry, but I have to study for an exam tomorrow.*
>
> ### Record 2
>
> ***Rachel****: Hey Mon, what are you doing now? Wanna come see a movie with us?*
>
> ***Monica****: Uhh, y'know I was gonna do some laundry.*
>
> ### Record 3
>
> ***Mike:*** *Hey Ryan, will you lend me your math book tonight?*
>
> ***Ryan:*** *Gee, I don't know. I was gonna use it myself that night.*
>
> ### Record 4
>
> ***Bill:*** *Ann, could you lend me your notebook for a few hours?*
>
> ***Ann:*** *Well, sorry Bill, but you see I need it now.*

Second step: Students wrote one invitation/ refusal and one request/ refusal example in their notebooks.

Third step: Students simulated the dialogues they had watched.

APPENDIX D-1

Pre- Test & Post- Test (Part 1)

1) Write an appropriate answer in English for the given situations

   Verilen durumlara uygun birer cevap yazınız (İngilizce)

1. Kantinde yeni tanıştığın bir arkadaşınla karşılaştın. Bu arkadaşın senin İngilizce kitabını istiyor. Ama senin yarına İngilizce sınavın var, bu yüzden kitabı kendin kullanacaksın. Bu isteğe nasıl "hayır" dersin?

_____.

2. Bir sınıf arkadaşın yeni aldığın dizüstü bilgisayarını bir geceliğine senden istiyor. Sen de nasıl kullanacağına güvenemediğin için vermek istemiyorsun. Arkadaşını kırmadan bu isteğe nasıl "hayır" dersin?

_____.

3. Pazartesi gününe kadar bir ödev hazırlaman gerek. Hafta sonu bu ödevi hazırlamayı düşünüyorsun. En yakın arkadaşın onu sınava çalıştırmanı istiyor. Ona nasıl "hayır" dersin?

_____.

4. Bir sınıf arkadaşın seni bu akşamki doğum gününe davet ediyor. Doğum gününe gitmeyi gerçekten çok istiyorsun ama ailen akşam dışarı çıkmana izin vermiyor. Bu davete nasıl "hayır" dersin?

_____.

5. Kütüphanede bir arkadaşınla çalışıyorsun. Arkadaşın sana ders çalıştıktan sonra onun evine gitmeyi teklif ediyor. Ama akşam televizyonda uzun zamandır beklediğin bir film yayınlanıyor ve sen bu filmi izlemek istiyorsun. Arkadaşına nasıl "hayır" dersin?

_____.

6. Bir arkadaşın oynayacakları tiyatroda kullanmak için dedenden sana kalan saati istiyor ama bu saat senin için çok değerli olduğundan ona vermek istemiyorsun. Arkadaşına nasıl "hayır" dersin?

_____.

APPENDIX D-2

Pre- Test & Post- Test (Part 2)

2) Choose the most appropriate answer

1) Okul değiştirdin ve yeni arkadaşlarınla ilk günün. Sınıfındaki arkadaşların okul çıkışı bir arkadaşının evinde toplanacaklar. Arkadaşın seni de davet etti. Ama annen okuldan çıkar çıkmaz eve gelmeni söylemişti. Bu davete nasıl "hayır" dersin?

a. Uhm, I really wish to come with you. But I don't want to.

b. I don't think so.

c. Uhm, I promise I will come with you next time.

2) Okulunuza yeni gelen bir arkadaşın senden şu ana kadarki notları almak için matematik defterini istiyor. Pazartesi gününe geri getireceğini söylüyor ama sen hafta sonu pazartesi günkü matematik sınavına çalışmayı planlıyorsun. Arkadaşını kırmadan ona nasıl "hayır" dersin?

a. Well, I can't will it to you.

b. Why do you always want something from me?

c. Well, sorry but I am going to use it myself this weekend. I can give it to you next week.

3) Televizyonda en sevdiğin programın başlamasına bir iki saat var. Evde canın sıkıldı, biraz yürüyüşe çıktın. Yolda birkaç arkadaşınla karşılaştın. Arkadaşların beraber voleybol (ya da futbol) oynamaya gidiyorlardı. Bir elemanları eksikti. Seni çağırdılar. Ama sen eve dönüp o programı izlemek istiyorsun. Arkadaşlarına nasıl "hayır" dersin?

a. Mmm, I am sorry but I have got a headache. Why don't you ask someone else?

b. Well, I won't come with you.

c. I am sorry.

4) Baban sana karne hediyesi olarak bir bisiklet aldı. Bir arkadaşın bir günlüğüne bisikletini ödünç almak istiyor. Sen de daha bir iki kez bindiğin bisikletini vermek istemiyorsun. Arkadaşını kırmadan bu isteğe nasıl "hayır" dersin?

a. Uhh, sorry, my mother got angry with me when I gave my bicycle to someone else.

b. I don't want to give you my bicycle. You will break it.

c. Uhm, I don't think I can.

5) Bir arkadaşın yeni aldığın kazağını senden ödünç istiyor kazağı daha hiç giymedin ve onun bu kazağı güzel kullanacağına inanmıyorsun. Bu isteğe nasıl "hayır" dersin?

a. Uhh, I… I don't know.

b. Uhh, sorry, but you know I will wear it myself.

c. Sorry but I can't help you. You should have asked me earlier.

6) Yakın bir arkadaşın yarın taşınıyor. Sen de onu yolcu etmek istiyorsun. Aynı zamanda en yakın arkadaşın aynı gün seni yemeğe çağırıyor. Bu davete nasıl "hayır" dersin?

a. Well, thank you for your polite offer.

b. Well, that is a really good offer, but I should say good bye to Selda. You know they are moving tomorrow.

c. I am afraid I can't.

APPENDIX E

Classification of refusals

I. Direct

A. **<u>Performative</u>** (e.g., " I refuse")

B. **<u>Nonperformative</u>** statement

1. "No"

2. Negative willingness ("I can't". "I won't". "I don't think so".)

II. Indirect

A. **<u>Statement of regret</u>** (e.g., "I'm sorry…"; "I feel terrible…")

B. **<u>Wish</u>** (e.g., "I wish I could help you…")

C. **<u>Excuse, reason, explanation</u>** (e.g., "My children will be home that night."; "I have

a headache.")

D. **<u>Statement of alternative</u>**

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. **<u>Set condition for future or past acceptance</u>** (e.g., "If you had asked me earlier, I

would have…")

F. **<u>Promise of future acceptance</u>** (e.g., "I'll do it next time"; "I promise I'll…" or

"Next time I'll…"-using "will" of promise or "promise")

G. **<u>Statement of principle</u>** (e.g., "I never do business with friends.")

H. **<u>Statement of philosophy</u>** (e.g., "One can't be too careful.")

I. **<u>Attempt to dissuade interlocutor</u>**

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 customers who want to sit a while: I can't make a

living off people who just offer coffee.")

3. Criticize request/requester, etc. (statement of negative 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.")

Adjuncts to Refusals

1. Statement of positive opinion/feeling or agreement ("That's a good idea…"; "I'd love to…")

2. Statement of empathy (e.g., "I realize you are in a difficult situation.")

3. Pause fillers (e.g., "uhh"; "well"; "oh"; "uhm")

4. Gratitude/ appreciation

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

FOOTNOTES

---

[i]   The productive parts of the tests can be seen in APPENDIX D- part 2.

[ii]   Meaning *I have to do my homework. May be next time.*

[iii]   Meaning *I love this watch very much.*

[iv]   Mening *I need it.*

[v]   Meaning *to us, to visit us.*

[vi]   Meaing *it is a memory from my grandmother*

[vii]   Meaning *it is very valuable for me*

[viii]   Meaning *I have loosen the watch.*

[ix]   The lesson plan was prepared depending on the study of Silva (2003). The lesson was partly in L1 partly in the target language.