

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENTS IN CROSS CULTURAL PRAGMATICS**Zahra Loghmani****PhD student of Applied Linguistics****Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran****Abstract**

The data-gathering factors are one of the scopes of pragmatics which have gotten far reaching thought up to date. The foundation of crucial instruments in pragmatics examination can be set in a two-polar continuum. To one side, there are the perception/insight schedules and at the other side other methods are situated. Every one level then has its own specific instruments. Concerning the perception/insight frameworks, instruments, for instance, rating, different choice, and gathering endeavors can be utilized. In progress schedules, instruments, for instance, talk completing, close imagine, open imagine, and view of dependable talk are put (Kasper & Dahl, 1991). Also, strategies can be requested as demonstrated by an observational continuum. In the roused end, systems, for instance, rating, diverse choice, meeting assignments, talk completing, imagination, and open imagine are put. In the observational end, impression of genuine talk is used. This study is profitable for teachers who are excited about controlling systematic studies and may not be well known which instrument they should utilize in particular conditions.

Keywords: Pragmatics, Speech Act, Data Collection, Methodology

1. Introduction

One of the ranges of pragmatics which has been of extensive level headed discussion is the instrument used to inspire and accumulate information (Hinkel, 1997). There are distinctive sorts of information, accepting each of which obliges vast scale research. The pioneer ponders on discourse act utilized different instrument not at all like commonsense examination instruments used in present studies. Table 1 shows preparatory studies on discourse act focused around different instruments:

Table 1

Pioneer Studies on Speech Act Based on Various Instruments

Study	Speech act	Proficiency	Instrument
Walters (1980)	Requests	intermediate/ advanced	paired comparison
Carrell&Konneker (1981)	Requests	intermediate/ advanced	card sorting
Tanaka &Kawade (1982)	Requests	Advanced	card sorting, multiple choice
Olshain & Blum- Kulka (1985)	requests, apologies	not reported	3 point scale
Carrell (1979)	indirect answers	intermediate/ advanced	multiple choice
Carrell (1981)	Requests	low-int./int. high.int./adv.	multiple choice
Kasper (1984)	responding acts	intermediate/ advanced	open role play

Walters (1980) concentrated on the affableness marvel in solicitation techniques focused around card matched correlation. The members were to choose the relative graciousness of 'quiets down' and 'please be tranquil' independent of the connection. Carrell and Konneker (1981) explored non-local speakers' view of neighborliness in appeal methodologies. They displayed eight solicitation techniques composed on cards and the members were asked to sort the procedures as per obligingness. Among the methodologies, local speakers alluded to five and NNS specified seven appeal methods as being amiable. Tanaka and Kawade (1982) repeated the study directed via Carrell and Konneker (1981) in which they examined consideration techniques focused around social setting. They arranged a survey and asked the understudies to pick the amenability system that best speaks to the circumstances.

In an alternate study, Olshain and Blum-Kulka (1985) inspected neighborliness in appeal and expression of remorse discourse demonstrations of NNS of Hebrew. They utilized a poll of four solicitation and four expression of remorse circumstances and these circumstances were joined by six distinctive appeal and conciliatory sentiment methods. Members were asked to choose which methodology is suitable for the circumstances portrayed. Carrell (1979) utilized a poll with twenty-

seven short dialogs and an ensuing three different decision answers to explore non-local appreciation of backhanded answers. In the study done via Carrell (1981), the instrument was a different decision poll focused around forty tape-recorded appeals and the members were asked to separate in the middle of positive and negative solicitations. The assemblage of exploration which was portrayed prior, for the most part attempted to inspect recognition and cognizance. Be that as it may, Kasper (1984) utilized the information focused around conversational execution to explore people's down to business appreciation.

The worry of most methodological exchanges is to what degree the instrument is fit to rough legitimate execution (Kasper & Dahl, 1991; Billmyer & Varghese, 2000). In the same vein, Manes and Wolfson (1981) contended that the most legitimate data originates from sociolinguistic examination which underlines ethnographic perception. Nonetheless, Manes and Wolfson's utopia was not increased in value via analysts and numerous reactions were archived on the utilization of ethnographic perception (Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989; Aston, 1995). Since perception did not fulfill the analysts, an alternate instrument alluded to as talk finishing test (DCT) was utilized to examine down to business information. As it is referred to in Kasper and Dahl (1991), "Talk Completion Tasks have been an abundantly utilized and a tremendously ambushed elicitation design in culturally diverse and interlanguage pragmatics." Discourse fruition undertakings (or tests) are a few prompts focused around different circumstances in which people are obliged to compose their responses in every scene. Levenston and Blum (1978) were the first scientists who created DCTs to study lexical rearrangements, and Blum-Kulka (1982) adjusted it to examine discourse act. After these spearheading studies, a group of examination went hand in hand with the recently created DCT instrument for the acknowledgment of distinctive discourse acts (Blum-Kulka, 1982; Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1986; Faerch & Kasper, 1989; House & Kasper, 1987; Kasper, 1989; Olshtain & Weinbach, 1987).

Nonetheless, the primes of DCTs don't keep going for quite a while. A few reactions were leveled at DCTs as well. Among the reactions of DCTs, failure to assemble legitimate data and conflict with the condition of-the-workmanship writing were more pleasant. As an endeavor to enhance the nature of DCTs, Billmyer and Varghese (2000) led a study on appeal discourse act focused around a changed DCT in which the enhanced situational prompts were given to local and non-local speakers of English. The adjustment included improving the situational prompts and more expounded demands in local and non-local gatherings.

Hinkel (1997) attempted to approve various decision and DCT instruments through a study done on Chinese speakers. In an alternate comparative study, Golato (2003) contemplated the distinctions among compliment reaction sorts as for two instruments. Golato utilized discussion diagnostic procedure and a talk consummation undertaking to evoke information. In the wake of dissecting the information, Golato made sense of that "these information accumulation techniques don't generally yield information that talk similarly well to given exploration questions" (p. 90). He further contended that regularly happening talk is helpful to uncover the association of dialect however DCTs are useful to show related knowledge with dialect. Johnston, Kasper, and Ross (1998) examined the impact of distinctive sorts of replies, for example, positive, negative, and missing on local and non-local source decisions of protests, solicitations, and statements of regret. They pushed that there is a relationship

between the kind of reply and the decision of methods. Their study was principally directed to accept diverse information elicitation systems commonly happening and generation instruments.

Rose (1992) with stress on more culturally diverse studies on discourse act, researched two types of DCTs focused around the consideration and avoidance of listener reaction. Rose figured out that "in spite of the fact that reactions on the non-listener reaction DCT had a tendency to be marginally more and utilized somewhat more strong moves and downgraders, consideration of listener reaction did not have a huge impact on appeals evoked" (p. 49).

Pretend is an alternate instrument utilized as a part of down to earth studies. Walters (1980) researched youngsters interlanguage discourse act focused around pretend. He watched youngsters while they were playing and communicating with manikins. He resulted in these present circumstances acknowledgment that punctuation and even minded information are not identified with one another; at the end of the day, kids had the capacity utilize the dialect with suitable pleasantness yet they were not ready to create linguistically sound sentences. Scarcella (1979) utilized recorded open pretends to examine formative examples of consideration. Kasper (1981) directed a study on 48 dyads of German learners of English and recorded their pretends did on different discourse acts, for example, demands, proposals, offers, welcomes, and grumblings.

The discoveries of Kasper study demonstrate that the discourse demonstration example of members were identified with not L1 or L2. This implies that the members' interlanguage were methodical and autonomous in performing discourse act. Nonetheless, the study is constrained to two societies. More studies are expected to examine the interlanguage pragmatics. Tanaka (1988) was an alternate creator who utilized pretend in mulling over discourse act. Tanaka dissected the solicitation discourse demonstration of Japanese learners while they were communicating with companions or instructors. The associations were recorded. The discoveries uncovered that nonnative understudies utilized more straightforward techniques to perform demands. Trosborg's (1987) study manages Danish statement of regret discourse act with diverse capability levels while they were collaborating with local speakers of English. Trosborg specified that amenability fluctuates as for members' capability level.

A few studies have utilized perceptions to gather information on specific discourse acts. Wolfson's (1989a) study which last around 2 years and analyzed compliment and compliment reactions managed "ethnographic information gathered through perception and recording of characteristically happening discourse in ordinary associations in a wide mixture of circumstances" (Wolfson, p. 227). In an alternate study focused around perception, Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (1990) found that nonnative speakers offered fewer recommendations as for local speakers.

Hinkel calls attention to that talk culmination tests (DCTs) have been generally utilized as a method for contrasting local speakers and non-local speakers' socio-realistic practices. She resulted in these present circumstances acknowledgment that "DCTs may not be the best elicitation instrument for L1 and L2 information relating to uncertain and situationally obliged pragmalinguistic acts" (p. 1). Hinkel further accentuated that:

The perfect information for discourse act examination would comprise of a substantial number of deliberately recorded perceptions of specific discourse acts by illustrative subjects and control gathering subjects in comparative characteristic circumstances when the subjects are unconscious of the perception. (p. 2)

Huth and Taleghani-Nikazm (2006) resulted in these present circumstances acknowledgment that the data got through discussion investigation based studies is strikingly not the same as the same information accumulated through DCTs. They contended that when needed to finish the DCTs, "local speakers overwhelmingly expressed that they would acknowledge compliments with "Danke" which distinct difference a glaring difference to their genuine interactional conduct, where no 'thank you' could be found whatsoever" (p. 63). Rose (1992) considered the development of DCTsin which two manifestations of a DCT were explored. One structure was assembled through listener reaction and the other did not. The information accumulated by the two structures were indistinguishable and the utilization of listener reaction did not have huge impact on the evoked appeals.

Billmyer and Varghese (2000) attempted to discover the impact of orderly adjustment to the DCT for evoking solicitations delivered by local and non-local speakers of English. The discoveries of their study uncovered the vitality of outside adjustment of generation discourse act.

Numerous different specialists attempted to research discourse acts focused around a blend of distinctive instruments some of which were specified in the recent past. Case in point, numerous studies utilized joined generation and metapragmatic evaluation information (Einstein & Bodman, 1986; Fraser, Rintell, & Walters, 1980; Garcia, 1989; House, 1988; Olshtain, 1983; Olshtain & Cohen, 1983; Rintell, 1981; Takahashi & Dufon, 1989) while some utilized diverse sorts of creation information in their methodology.

Bardovi-Harlig (1999) censured that the way of interlanguage is disregarded in studies on interlanguage pragmatics. The primary thought process behind his examination on interlanguage in interlanguage pragmatics was the study led by Kasper and Schmidt (1996) which expressed that the fundamental center of interlanguage pragmatics is culturally diverse pragmatics. What Bardovi-Harlig attempted to stress was the way people secure pragmatics and said that there is an incredible requirement for longitudinal research on acquisitional parts of interlanguage pragmatics. His discontent of similar nature of logical studies and his enthusiasm toward the thought of acquisitional pragmatics lay in the thought that "numerous articles from 1979 to 1996 except for the unequivocally acquisitional studies with cross-sectional and longitudinal plans distinguish non-local speakers as 'non-local speakers' instead of learners, and they are portrayed just by their first dialect" (p. 680). Perhaps one of the concerns of Bardovi-Harlig is that researchers ought to give careful consideration to the methodology of picking up capability in pragmatics not simply turning to similar studies. His worry is in accordance with the way of second dialect procurement examines in which the procedure of securing is of key essentialness.

Demeter (2007) expressed that philosophy and instrument utilized as a part of social event sober minded learning of people are of key vitality which can impact the result of the study. He further uncovers that the greater part of the studies led on pragmatics utilization "talk fruition tests, meetings, polls, corpus semantics, or common associations" (p. 83). Underscoring the utilization of pretends in down to business studies, he thought about two sets of results acquired through pretend and a talk finishing test and resulted in these present circumstances understanding that "in spite of the fact that DCTs are more suitable for mulling over the principle sorts of procedures in discourse act creation,

pretends appear a finer decision when the association between the speaker and listener is additionally critical for the study" (p. 88).

Grotjahn and Kasper (1991) examined different techniques utilized as a part of second dialect securing in which discourse act hypothesis is additionally considered. Bonikowska (1988) brought another point of view into the field of logical study in that in this study the speaker's choice not to perform a discourse demonstration is mulled over. Bonikowska resulted in these present circumstances acknowledgment that it is the commonsense decision that matters as well as withdrawing decision is critical as well.

In outline, a portion of the methodological issues in regards to assembling results are said underneath (Martinez-Flor, 2005; Martinez-Flor, 2006; Martinez-Flor&Fukuya, 2005; Martinez-Flor&Soler, 2004):

- **Hinkel (1997):**
 - DCTs may not be the best elicitation instrument for investigating pragmatic knowledge.
- **Bardovi-Harlig (1999):**
 - Lack of longitudinal research on pragmatics.
 - A need for more studies on acquisitional aspects of pragmatics.
 - Current studies on pragmatics have ignored the nature of interlanguage.
 - DCTs are not a good device to gauge interlanguage pragmatics of learners at all levels.
- **Golato (2003):**
 - Manifold advantages of DCTs.
 - The results obtained from DCTs are very different from naturalistically collected data.
 - In interactions, individuals use strategies different from what is obtained through DCTs.
- **Huth and Taleghani-Nikazm (2006):**
 - Conversation-analysis-based materials provide learners with socio-pragmatically appropriate verbal behavior.
 - The information obtained from DCTs is strikingly different from the same information gathered by conversation-analysis-based studies.
- **Demeter (2007):**
 - DCTs are appropriate for studying various strategies in speech acts and role-plays are good instruments to find out the nature of interactions between learner and speaker.
 - Responses provided through DCTs are much longer than the ones provided by role-plays.

Therefore, it can be concluded that every social context may impose some limitations on the choice of words and sentences which is different across cultures. Another factor which renders the research on pragmatics cumbersome is the instrument itself. As it is mentioned by Kasper and Dahl (1991), the purpose of the study influences the choice of instruments. According to Kasper and Dahl (1991):

In pragmatics, we are dealing with a double layer of variability: (a) variability that reflects the social properties of the speech event, and the strategic, actional, and linguistic choices by which interlocutors attempt to reach their communicative goals; and (b) the variability induced by different instruments of data collection. (p. 215)

2. Politeness Strategies

One of the hidden standards of pragmatics is good manners. Verschueren (1999, p. 45) said that "amenability has turned into a spread term in pragmatics for whatever decisions are made in dialect use in connection to the need to safeguard individuals' face all in all, i.e. their open mental self view." Then, an alternate demonstration can be added to Austin's three sorts of act and that is face-undermining act or FTA.

Verschueren (1999, p. 45) characterized constructive face as "an individual's have to be dealt with as an equivalent or insider" and antagonistic face as "an individual's have to have opportunity of activity."

Neighborliness methodologies have been the worry of numerous studies in pragmatics. Ide (1989) mulled over the comprehensiveness of respectfulness techniques and the examination of decision of systems as indicated by social traditions or interactional technique. Kasper (1990) analyzed good manners speculations and proposed four subjects considering graciousness hypotheses, specifically, key clash shirking and social indexing, the phonetic authorization of affableness, social and mental variables, the effect of talk on amiability. Meier (1995) guaranteed that the idea of graciousness is not clear enough and attempted to focus the extent of obligingness in cooperations.

Respectfulness wonder has dependably been one of the concerns of discourse act studies. Graciousness methods are of foremost criticalness with regards to diverse discourse acts. Pfister (2010) gave two contentions to backing the adage of neighborliness. From one perspective, enlivened by Brown and Levinson (1978) and Fraser and Nolen's hypothesis, Pfister accepted that issues of respectful conduct can be clarified through the saying of pleasantness. Then again, Pfister (p. 1266) specified that "the saying of respectfulness is a piece of sane discussion among conceivably forceful gatherings." Therefore, Pfister contended that another proverb ought to be included request to have a reasonable correspondence and called that the adage of good manners. Consideration is of various quality in that it incorporates some key fixings, for example, people's energy connections, standards of the general public, and social foundation, to name a couple. The present writing audit presents three hypotheses of affableness which are exhibited beneath:

- Lakoff's tenets of courteousness (1973)
- Brown and Levinson's hypothesis of amenability (1978)
- Leech's amenability standard (1983)

Lakoff (1973) advances two fundamental standards of realistic be clear and be courteous and contends that these two components are opposing to one another in that being clear and instructive does not match with cordial situations. It implies that in most casual circumstances helpful standards are disregarded through utilizing figures of speech or unexpected sentences and courteousness takes the spot of clarity. Leech (1980, 1980) likewise examined the past speculations of human discussion and proffered that courteousness rule (PP) ought to be a piece of agreeable standards. The creator kept up his thought as minimizing negative courteousness and augmenting positive politeness.

Conclusion

In this audit article, it was attempted to have a review of different instruments in the domain of pragmatics. As it was examined, each one instrument has its own particular points of interest and also its imperfections. To have an agreeable picture of ebb and flow methodological issues and to give learner specialists a general picture of what is going ahead in information elicitation and information get-together period of sober minded studies, which is one of the principle concerns in down to business research, this audit article is of incredible help. The majority of the specialists who are going to direct studies on pragmatics and discourse act verbs are not acquainted with diverse instruments in the field and they may have troubles picking a suitable instrument which best speak to their motivation. The matter of legitimacy is under question if the instrument neglects to speak to what the analyst attempted to examine. In this sense, we propose that the specialist use diverse instruments and analyze the results. In spite of the fact that this pattern is time intensive furthermore illogical, if led painstakingly, it can furnish scientists with consoling information since the usage of different instruments will unquestionably diminish the legitimacy issues.

References

- Aston, G. (1995). Say 'thank you': Some pragmatic constraints in conversational closings. *Applied Linguistics*, 16(1), 57–86.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1996). Pragmatics and language teaching: Bringing pragmatics and pedagogy together. In L. Bouton & Y. Kachru (Eds.), *Pragmatics and Language Learning, Monograph 3* (pp. 21-39). Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Division of English as an International Language.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1999). Exploring the interlanguage of interlanguage pragmatics: A research agenda for acquisitional pragmatics. *Language Learning*, 49(4), 677-713.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Do language learners recognize pragmatic violations? Pragmatic versus grammatical awareness in instructed L2 learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(2), 233-262.
- Beebe, L. M., & Cummings, M. C. (1996). Natural speech data versus written questionnaire data: How data collection method affects speech act performance. In S.M Gass & J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Billmyer, K., & Varghese, M. (2000). Investigating instrument-based pragmatic variability: Effects of enhancing discourse completion tests. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(4), 517-552.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1982). Learning how to say what you mean in a second language: A study of speech act performance of learners of Hebrew as a second language. *Applied Linguistics*, 3, 29-59.

- Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1986). Too many words: Length of utterances and pragmatic failure. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 8(2), 165-179.
- Blum-Kulka, S, House, J., & Kasper, G. (Eds.) (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood: Ablex Publishing.
- Bonikowska, M. P. (1988). The choice of opting out. *Applied Linguistics*, 9(2), 169-181.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. (5th ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Carrell, P. L. (1979). Indirect speech acts in ESL: Indirect answers. In C. A. Yorio, K. Perkins, & J. Schachter (Eds.), *On TESOL 79* (pp. 297-307). Washington, DC.: TESOL.
- Carrell, P. L. (1981). Children's understanding of indirect requests: comparing child and adult comprehension. *Journal of Child Language*, 8, 329-345.
- Carrell, P. L., & Konneker, B. H. (1981). Politeness: comparing native and nonnative judgments. *Language learning*, 31(1), 17-30.
- Cohen, A. (1996). Investigating the production of speech act sets. In S. M. Gass & J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures* (pp. 23-43). Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Demeter, G. (2007). Role-plays as a data collection method for research on apology speech acts. *Simulation & Gaming*, 38(1), 83-90.
- Eisenstein, M., & Bodman, J. W. (1986). 'I very appreciate': Expressions of gratitude by native and non-native speakers of American English. *Applied Linguistics*, 7, 167-185.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1989). Internal and external modification in interlanguage request realization. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics* (pp. 221-247). Norwood, N. J.: Ablex.
- Fraser, B., Rintell, E., & Walters, J. (1980). An approach to conducting research on the acquisition of pragmatic competence in a second language. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.), *Discourse analysis in second language research* (pp. 75-91). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., & Hyams, N. (2003). *An introduction to language* (7th ed.). Massachusetts: Thomson Heinle.
- Garcia, C. (1989). Apologizing in English: Politeness strategies used by native and non-native speakers. *Multilingual*, 8, 3-20.
- Golato, A. (2003). Studying compliment responses: A comparison of DCTs and recordings of naturally occurring talk. *Applied Linguistics*, 24(1), 90-121.
-

- Grotjahn, R., & Kasper, G. (1991). Methods in second language research: Introduction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 13(2), 109-112.
- Hinkel, E. (1997). Appropriateness of advice: DCT and multiple choice data. *Applied Linguistics*, 18(1), 1-26.
- House, J. (1988). "Oh excuse me please...": Apologizing in a foreign language. In B. Kettemann, P. Bierbaumer, A. Fill, & A. Karpf (Eds.), *English als Zweitsprache* (pp. 303-327). Tuebingen: Narr.
- House, J., & Kasper, G. (1987). Interlanguage pragmatics: Requesting in foreign language. In W. Loersch & R. Schulze (Eds.), *Perspectives on language in performance: Festschrift for Werner Huellen* (pp. 1250-1288). Tuebingen: Narr.
- Huth, T., & Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (2006). How can insights from conversation analysis be directly applied to teaching L2 pragmatics? *Language Teaching Research*, 10(1), 53-79.
- Johnston, B., Kasper, G., & Ross, S. (1998). Effect of rejoinders in production questionnaires. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(2), 157-182.
- Kasper, G. (1981). *Pragmatic Aspekte in der Interimsprache*. Tuebingen: Narr.
- Kasper, G. (1984). Pragmatic comprehension in learner native speaker discourse. *Language Learning*, 34(4), 1-20.
- Kasper, G. (1989). Variation in interlanguage speech act realization. In S. Gass, C. Madden, D. Preston, & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Variation in second language acquisition: Discourse and pragmatics* (pp. 37-58). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 13, 215-247.
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. (1999). Pragmatics and SLA. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 19, 81-104.
- Kasper, G., & Schmidt, R. (1996). Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18, 149-169.
- Levenston, E., & Blum, S. (1978). Discourse completion as a technique for studying lexical features of interlanguage. *Working Papers in Bilingualism*, 15, 13-21.
- Manes, J., & Wolfson, N. (1981). The Compliment formula. In F. Coumas (Ed.), *Conversational routine: Explorations in standardized communication situations and prepatterned speech* (pp. 115-132). The Hague: Mouton Publishers.
- Martínez-Flor, A. (2005). A theoretical review of the speech act of suggesting: Towards taxonomy for its use in FLT. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 18, 167-187.

- Martínez-Flor, A. (2006). Task effects on EFL learners' production of suggestions: A focus on elicited phone messages and Emails. *Journal of English and American Studies*, 33, 47-64.
- Martínez-Flor, A., & Fukuya, Y. J. (2005). The effects of instruction on learners' production of appropriate and accurate suggestions. *Pragmatics in Instructed Language Learning*, 33(3), 463-480.
- Martínez-Flor, A., & Soler, A. E. (2004). Developing pragmatic awareness of suggestions in the EFL classroom: A focus on instructional effects. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(2), 279-306.
- Nelson, G., Carson, J., Al Batal, M., and El Bakary, W. (2002). Cross-cultural pragmatics: Strategy use in Egyptian Arabic and American English refusals. *Applied Linguistics*, 23(2), 163-189.
- Nurani, L. (2009). Methodological issues in pragmatic research: Is discourse completion test a reliable data collection instrument? *Jurnal Sosiologi Edisi*, 17(8), 667-678.
- Olshain, E., & Cohen, A. (1983). Apology: A speech act set. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and second language acquisition* (pp. 18-35). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Olshain, E., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1985). Degree of approximation: Nonnative reactions to native speech act behavior. In S. M. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 303-325). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Dictionary of language teaching & applied linguistics* (3rd ed.). Pearson Education: Longman.
- Rintell, E. (1981). Sociolinguistic variation and pragmatic ability: A look at learners. *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 27, 11-34.
- Rintell, E., & Mitchell, C. J. (1989). Studying requests and apologies: An inquiry into method. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 248-272). Norwood, N. J.: Ablex.
- Rose, K. R. (1992). Speech acts and questionnaires: The effect of hearer response. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 17(1), 49-62.
- Scarcella, R. (1979). On speaking politely in a second language. In C. A. Yorio, K. Perkins, & J. Schachter (Eds.), *On TESOL 79* (pp. 275-287). Washington, D.C.: TESOL.
- Takahashi, S., & Dufon, P. (1989). *Cross-linguistic influence in indirectness: The case of English directives performed by native Japanese speakers*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Hawaii at Manoa.
- Tanaka, N. (1988). Politeness: Some problems for Japanese speakers of English. *JALT Journal*, 9, 81-102.

Tanaka, S., & Kawade, S. (1982). Politeness strategies and second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 5, 18-33.

Trosborg, A. (1987). Apology strategies in natives/non-natives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 11(2), 147-167.

Turnbull, W. (2001). An appraisal of pragmatic elicitation techniques for the social psychological study of talk: The case of request refusals. *Pragmatics*, 11(1), 31-61.

Verschueren, J. (1999). *Understanding pragmatics*. London: Arnold.

Walters, J. (1980). Grammar, meaning and sociocultural appropriateness in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 34, 337-345.

Wolfson, N. (1989). The social dynamics of native and nonnative variation in complementing behavior. In Miriam Eisenstein (Ed.), *The dynamic interlanguage* (pp. 219-236). New York: Plenum.