CHAPTER 3

EMPIRICAL STUDY:
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter details the methodology, the procedures undertaken, the instrument (WDCT), and the treatment (instructional material) used in the process of validating the hypothesis empirically. The hypothesis states that *Pragmatic competence in English as second language can be developed through explicit and interventional teaching in which learners' acquire a holistic understanding of the language*

Kasper and Rose (2002) have proposed that acquisitional pragmatics research needs to take task type into consideration, make use of sufficiently detailed transcriptions of the type used in conversation analytic research (e.g., Kasper, 2004a; Markee, 2000, 2004), look at individual learner contributions in the context of interaction, and present adequately detailed and contextualized data excerpts when discussing findings. With Kasper and Rose’s challenge in mind, the chapter details the research design, participants, materials, procedure, and scoring and analyses associated with the present study.

It explains the procedures of forming a Select Group for the investigation. Eighty undergraduate students of Ahmednagar College, Ahmednagar, Maharashtra, took the grammar test that dealt with the basic structures of English. This was to identify and choose the students who have at least the basic minimum linguistic competence needed
for participating in the experiment. Of the eighty students who appeared for this grammar
test, twenty five students were selected on the basis of their performance. Of these
twenty five qualified students, twenty students volunteered to participate as subjects in
the research study. These selected students would form the Select Group. These students
or Informants were allotted a number from one to twenty. For the purpose of empirical
study, Discourse Completion Tests (DCTs) were used for pretest and posttest.
Comparison of the scores of pretest and posttest would reflect the linguistic behaviour
through test scores. A Discourse Completion Test (DCT) is a set of briefly described
situations designed to elicit a particular speech act. For the present study the researcher
has found Written Discourse Completion Test fit as a valid instrument. Through this
instrument the Select Group would read each situation and respond to a prompt in
writing. The chapter details the procedures involved in the administration of a pretest and
a posttest to the Select Group.

The teaching methodology applied included group work, pair work, discussions, etc.
The instructional materials were drawn from conversational pieces / dialogues from
books and movies.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

The methodology used in this study is described as follows:
3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

The programmed instructional materials of the present study were built and expanded upon the pretest performed by a selected group of students. The influence of previous studies in the area of developing L2 pragmatics is evident in the design of the present study. The focus of the study is on the effect of input in learners’ developing pragmalinguistic proficiency with respect to four different types of speech acts. Consideration was also given to the reliability and validity for assessing the development of pragmatic competence of the learners. The research design is depicted in Figure 1.

AIM: DEVELOPING PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE BY WAY OF EXPLICIT TEACHER FRONTED CLASSROOM TEACHING

STAGE ONE: GRAMMAR TEST ON THE PARTICIPANTS TO FORM A SELECT GROUP

STAGE TWO: FORMING A SELECT GROUP OF 20 STUDENTS FOR ADMINISTERING A PRETEST

STAGE THREE: CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION AND PRACTISING BY WAY OF HOME ASSIGNMENTS, ROLE PLAYS, GROUP WORK, DISCUSSIONS

STAGE FOUR: PRODUCTION OF SPEECH ACTS BY WAY OF POSTTEST

RESEARCH FINDINGS: SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENT IN UNDERSTANDING SPEECH ACTS AND IMPLICATURES

FIGURE 1

3.2 PROCEDURE

The procedure for forming the Select Group is used as follows:
3.2.1 STAGE ONE: GRAMMAR TEST

The grammar test (Appendix A) was designed and administered to a group of students for more than one reason:

i) To test knowledge of grammatical structures and forms

ii) To filter out those students who did not qualify minimum requirements of grammar

iii) It also provided insights into how students may have more knowledge of grammatical rules than socio-cultural/socio-linguistic knowledge as hypothesized by the researcher.

Since linguistic competence becomes a precondition to developing pragmatic competence, testing the learners' grammatical knowledge was considered necessary. It is only when there is a sound linguistic knowledge can there be a reason for going ahead with learning to perform language use in socially and culturally appropriate ways.

3.2.1.1 GRAMMAR TEST MATERIAL

The test dealt with the following areas

i) Articles

ii) Tenses

iii) Active Voice/Passive voice

iv) Direct/Indirect speech

v) Comprehension
3.2.1.2 PARTICIPANTS

A grammar test that deals with the basic structures was administered to 80 undergraduate students of Ahmednagar College, Ahmednagar, in Maharashtra where the researcher teaches. This was to identify and choose the students who have the basic minimum linguistic competence needed for participating in the experiment. Of the eighty students who appeared for this grammar test, twenty five students were selected on the basis of their performance. Of these twenty five qualified students, twenty students volunteered to participate as subjects in the research study.

3.2.2 STAGE TWO: STUDENT SAMPLE

The test scores ranged between 61% and 90%. The average Mean was 75%. Forty students fared well in the grammar test. Twenty students, with fairly homogeneous linguistic competence, volunteered to be part of the research after they were told about the purpose of administering the grammar test. The grammar test score chart is presented in the Appendix D. They were informed about the research topic and purpose and objective of the need for doing the research.

The students were also informed about the benefit they would gain by being active part of the research in the form of a Select Group. These twenty students after giving their acceptance to be part of the study were given instructions and the detailed programme and schedule. The students were instructed not to consult each other while attempting
answers to the questions. They would be allowed to take their own time in solving the answers of pretest and posttest. The tests were to get their level of pragmatic competence. These tests were not meant to judge their abilities. They were also instructed that regularity in participation is a pre-requisite condition. They were informed about the programme that was already prepared.

3.3 INSTRUMENT

The instrument used for the present study was in the format of a WDCT. The pretest was designed with the following types of testing items viz., gap filling items, matching items and completion items. The pretest comprises questions that relate to those aspects of pragmatic literature that are intended for classroom instruction (see Appendix B & C). Pretest that was administered contained 30 questions each carrying one mark in order to determine the level of pragmatic abilities of the learners of the Select Group. Similarly a posttest was administered in similar lines to determine how much the Select Group benefitted from explicit classroom instruction and the progress they made by being able to use language in more socially appropriate ways. The content of material used in pretest and posttest is dealt with in detail in Chapter 2 of this study.

A pretest/posttest design was utilized as the preferred method by which to evaluate the learners’ performance. This design was chosen to ensure that these measures assessed the features appropriate to the scope of this study. The participants were not allowed to
interact with one another while completing the task. The pretest consisted of contextual situations.

The pretest not only served as the means by which to practice as well as demonstrate the functional aspects of language use in socially appropriate situations but also to expose students to what they would encounter in the posttest.

The posttest comprising similar task difficulty with different scenarios as in the case of pretest was administered on the Select Group after the pragmatic treatment.

The empirical study was implemented systematically in the order in which it was planned. The students would meet in the specified classroom between 1400 hrs and 1800 hrs on all the weekdays excluding Sundays which would make forty hours of teaching.

3.4 TREATMENT

3.4.1 TEACHING PROGRAMME

The teaching programme was planned for a four hour interaction a day for ten days. It would provide sufficient time and creates opportunity to plan and perform activities that are designed to be done in the classroom. To be in an environment of listening and speaking and working with other participants helps them in more than one ways. They can get more comfortable and friendly with each other and that would make them less self conscious while doing activities like role play, group work and presentations. This
selected group was taught Speech Acts encompassing major Sociopragmatic and Pragmalinguistic patterns and strategies of interpreting and realizing one particular speech act at the ‘explicit’, ‘conventional’, and ‘implicit’ or ‘indirect levels’ (Blum-Kulka and Olshtain, 1984). A ten day programme of instruction was planned with each day of four hours having three sessions of one hour long each with three breaks of fifteen minutes was decided to fulfill the instructional needs and activities. The instructional activities included description, explanation, teacher-fronted discussion, small-group discussions, and role plays on pragmatically focused tasks. Examples were provided pertaining to different speech acts emphasizing the fact that a specific form can have several functions and what forms are appropriate based on social distance and power relations. Tasks were administered and they were encouraged to compare their strategies with other members of the group.

3.4.2 INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIAL

Before the commencement of the teaching session one day prior to the classroom teaching, the researcher called all the twenty students together and conducted a pre session on general introduction of the researcher and the participants. During this session the participants introduced themselves. A discussion on participants' past experience with learning English language and what expectations they have of the present study took place. The purpose of having this pre session was to get:
(i) participants to become familiar with each other prior to performing group work and role plays
(ii) information on the difficulties that the participants faced while learning English language
(iii) their reaction to the usefulness of the syllabuses from school level to the present course that they are in.

The following are the instructional materials used for pragmatic treatment on the Select Group for a ten day programme.

**DAY 1, 2, 3, and 4: INFERENCING IMPLICATURES**

**D.1.1 Explanation:**

On these four days of treatment the researcher attempted to sensitize learners' ability to infer the meaning of implicatures. Grounded on Grice's theory of Cooperative Principles and Leech's Politeness Principles and also Sperber and Wilson's Relevance Theory, these sessions attempt to teach implicatures by sensitizing learners the role context plays, background knowledge, shared knowledge of the interlocutors involved that makes successful inferring of an implicature possible.

Grice developed the concept of implicature in order to account for the evident gap between the literal meaning of an utterance and the way it functions in a context. An implicature is an inference that people make often in order to interpret each other's discourse as logical, relevant, and cooperative. Grice's theory suggests why and how interlocutors are able to understand types of instances that appear to violate these basic
requirements on a superficial level. He offers an explanation for apparent tautologies (“a rose is a rose is a rose”), sarcasm (saying “you're a fine friend” to a person who has betrayed you), and as was discussed earlier the sequences such as:

- A: Where's Jason?
- B: The bus left two minutes ago.

Grice (1975, 1978) put forward conversational implicature as a possible answer of two issues. One of these was a contemporary philosophical debate pertaining to the value of ordinary language, thought by some to be logically general compared to formal logic, the language of science. Grice hoped that by employing a general principle, it would not be necessary to specify unwieldy appropriateness conditions for each speech-act type. Leech (1983: 91) noted that “John met a woman” implicates “John did not meet his wife,” and accounted for this as a quantity implicature, using the sort of reasoning Levinson sketched. But a parallel statement as Grice (1975: 38) himself noted like “John broke a finger” does not implicate “John did not break his own finger.” On the contrary, it means or implicates that John did break his own finger.

As pragmatic competence is a compounding of all these factors, the development of the pragmatic ability should be taken as one of the principal teaching goals. If looked at carefully, the students find the opportunity to experience language in different social contexts, they practice functions of language in a variety of interactive patterns, by using the right utterance at the right time, and they learn how to be socially responsible
language learners. Furthermore, the study of different communicative patterns not only helps the learners to be the active participants in the classroom but also encourages them to think seriously and creatively in second language. To sum up, language learning is a socio-cultural process which requires the application of linguistic rules in a variety of contexts, audiences and functions.

**D.1.2 Classroom instruction:**

Six types of materials were used in this study:

1. Observing Examples on Grice's Maxims and explanation of types of Implicatures
2. A series of small data cards which included various dialogues between A & B
3. Pair works to analyze the exchanges,
4. Task for diagnostic assessment (A collection of different contexts)
5. Exercise on exchanges based on Reference
6. Feedback and discussion.

Before carrying out the activities the researcher explained the nature and role of contexts, to identify an appropriate context for the comprehensive teaching of pragmatics use. Thus, an example, "I'm tired", was taken up to teach the Select Group the possible meanings of the example depending on the intention of the speaker.
I'm tired

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>INTENTION</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
<th>TYPE OF ACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A friend has just asked how I feel</td>
<td>To answer the question</td>
<td>I feel fatigued</td>
<td>Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone I'm trying to avoid has asked me if I'd like to go dancing tonight</td>
<td>To politely avoid her</td>
<td>I'd rather not</td>
<td>Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My husband and I are watching a football game on television</td>
<td>That we do something else</td>
<td>Could we turn this off?</td>
<td>Question or Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's late and my small children are asking if we can go to the movies</td>
<td>To put them to bed</td>
<td>No, go to bed</td>
<td>Command</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source:http://www.rdillman.com/HFCL/TUTOR/Relation/relate2.html)

Thus, it was explained that depending upon the context and the speaker's intention, a given utterance might become a statement, a command, a question, a request, a promise, and so on.

Furthermore, the researcher explained how meaning arises from interaction of linguistic meaning with contextual factors by giving the following dialogues:

(1) A: Has John got a girlfriend?

B: He's been making a lot of trips to Pune lately.

(2) A: I've run out of petrol.

B: There's a petrol pump just round the corner.
Later there was a discussion with the learners of the Select Group on Flouting of Maxims by taking the following examples:

Source:  http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Implicature

**Flouting Maxim of Quality**

(A friend's father considers whether or not to buy your friend a new car, and you are aware that the old car has broken down before.)

(1) A: Should I buy my son this new sports car?

    B: (Improper): I don't know if that's such a good idea, his car runs fine.

    B: (Proper) Yeah, that sounds like a good idea, his car breaks down all the time.

**Flouting Maxim of Quantity**

(A man stops his vehicle in the middle of the road to briefly ask you for directions.)

(2) A: Where is the post office?

    B: (Improper): There are two in town, but the closest one is brand new. Down the road, about 50 metres past the second left. Also, you shouldn't stop your car in the middle of the road anymore.

    B : (Improper): Not far.

    B: (Proper): Continue on, and make the second left up there. You'll see it.

**Flouting Maxim of Relevance**

(1) A: How are you doing in school?

    B : (Improper): What fine weather we're having lately!
B: (Proper): Not so well, I'm afraid. I'd rather not discuss it.

B: (Proper): Mind your own business.

(2) A: (Noticeably indicating boredom) Ugh, I wonder what time it is...

B: (Improper): It's 6:30.

B: (Proper): It's 6:30. So, you have the whole night ahead of you! Have you eaten at Harry's before?

B: (Proper): It's 6:30, I have a meeting to go to at 7:00, but maybe you'd like to do something afterwards?

**Flouting Maxim of Manner**

(1) A: Can you take out the trash?

B: (Improper): Well, it is probable that I would take out the trash more often if someone weren't flagrantly wasteful, such that the majority of trash weren't always coming from that person.

B: (Proper): Sure, but we need to talk about how we are assigning the chores around here when I get back.

Explanation:

It was explained to the learners that speakers who deliberately flout the maxims usually intend for their listener to understand their underlying implication. In the case of the clumsy friend, she would most likely understand that the speaker is truly not offering her a compliment. Therefore, cooperation is still taking place, but no longer on the literal level. Conversationalists can assume that when speakers intentionally flout a maxim, they still do so with the aim of expressing some thought. Thus, the researcher concluded that
Gricean Maxims serve a purpose in both the situations, when they are followed and when they are flouted. Thus, the researcher summed up by saying that the implicatures that arise out of the flouting of maxims are:

(i) the assumption that the maxims are adhered to points to certain meanings

(ii) violation of one maxim usually points to the importance of another

(iii) flouting a maxim invites a 'non-literal' interpretation

Next the researcher dealt with types of Implicatures. They were:

1. **(1) Conversational implicature**

   1. The speaker deliberately flouts a conversational maxim to convey an additional meaning not expressed literally.

   For instance, a speaker responds to the question "How did you like the guest speaker?" with the following utterance:

   _Well, I’m sure he was speaking English._

   If the speaker is assumed to be following the cooperative principle, in spite of flouting the Maxim of Quantity, then the utterance must have an additional nonliteral meaning, such as: "The content of the speaker’s speech was confusing."
2. The speaker’s desire to fulfill two conflicting maxims results in his or her flouting one maxim to invoke the other. For instance, a speaker responds to the question "Where is John?" with the following utterance:

*He’s either in the cafeteria or in his office.*

In this case, the Maxim of Quantity and the Maxim of Quality are in conflict. A cooperative speaker does not want to be ambiguous but also does not want to give false information by giving a specific answer in spite of his uncertainty. By flouting the Maxim of Quantity, the speaker invokes the Maxim of Quality, leading to the implicature that the speaker does not have the evidence to give a specific location where he believes John is.

3. The speaker invokes a maxim as a basis for interpreting the utterance. In the following exchange:

Do you know where I can get some gas? *There’s a gas station around the corner.*

The second speaker invokes the Maxim of Relevance, resulting in the implicature that “the gas station is open and one can probably get gas there”

(2) Scalar Implicature
According to Grice (1975), another form of conversational implicature is also known as a scalar implicature. This concerns the conventional uses of words like "all" or "some" in conversation.

*I ate some of the pie.*

This sentence implies "I did not eat all of the pie." While the statement "I ate some pie" is still true if the entire pie was eaten, the conventional meaning of the word "some" and the implicature generated by the statement is "not all".

(3) **Conventional implicature**

Conventional implicature is independent of the cooperative principle and its maxims. A statement always carries its conventional implicature.

*Joe is poor but happy.*

This sentence implies poverty and happiness are not compatible but in spite of this Joe is still happy. The conventional interpretations of the word "but" will always create the implicature of a sense of contrast. So *Joe is poor but happy* will always necessarily imply "Surprisingly Joe is happy in spite of being poor". Conventional implicatures cannot be cancelled (unlike conversational implicatures, which can be).

Next, a series of small cards were designed based on role of context. They were as follow:
1. A: What time is it?
   B: The evening news just started
2. A: When are you coming to visit us?
   B: I'm very busy at the moment
3. A: What on earth has happened to the roast beef?
   B: The dog is looking very happy.
4. A: Would you like to join us for a party
   B: I am tired
5. A: Did you enjoy your holiday?
   B: The beaches were crowded and the hotel was full of bugs.
6. A: Did I get invited to the conference?
   B: Your paper was too long.
   B: There’s a garage down the road.
8. A: Is there any shopping to do?
   B: We’ll be away for most of the weekend.
9. A: What time is it?
   B: The milk man hasn’t yet come.
10. A: What happened to all the sweets?
    B: My Sir and his wife dropped in the afternoon.

In each dialogue in the small cards were taught one by one explicitly for the Select Group and comprehensive explanations which demonstrate inferencing implicatures.
The teacher as well as the students, role discussed the dialogues to elaborate the situation based on the above contexts. The model dialogues and role play activities were directed to the explicit teaching group to reinforce the replies and context.

The task which was used in this study was composed of a set of dialogues. The learners were asked to indicate the appropriate level of agreement with regard to each context by writing the answers on the paper. The contexts used were:

Context: 1
Two friends have gone on a shopping. A tries on a pair of shoes, looks at B and asks,

What do you think? (What does A intend to ask)

Context: 2
Wife comes home all wet.

Husband (Watching T V): Is it raining?

Wife: What do you think?

Next, an exercise based on Reference was administered on the learners, in which the contexts are utilized to refer to someone who shares the knowledge / conventions and knowledge of context. This test was administered to check if the learners are able to understand the exchanges between two people in a particular context by providing them with the questions based on the given examples.

1. Where's the cheese sandwich?
   - What does the speaker want to know?
   - What response do you expect?
2. Tom: Hey Sarah, let's play carom
   Mother: How is your homework going on, Tom?
   • What does Tom's mother want?
   • How do we understand that?

3. A: Look at me! I'm fat and ugly.
   B: Come on, you're not fat!
   • What is the second speaker's intended message?
   • How is it expressed?

Feedback and discussion were the last activity used for the Select Group.

**DAY 5: APOLOGY**

**D.5.1 Explanation:**

An apology is needed when a social norm has been breached. Therefore, an apology can be broadly defined as consisting of the linguistic steps one takes to correct situations like violations. Apologies take different forms depending on how the person who caused the communicative clash comprehends his or her own actions, along with other variables such as age or familiarity of their interlocutor. If a speaker chooses to apologize in a certain situation (i.e. in response to a complaint, etc.), the apology can be realized directly ('I apologize') or indirectly.
With respect to its structure, an apology consists of the following strategies or formulas according to Brasdefer (2007)

1. Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (or the explicit expression of an apology)
2. Taking on responsibility
3. Explanation
4. Offer of repair
5. Promise of forbearance

An apology can also be modified within by means of various strategies that either stress on or soften the violation of the offense. These strategies include modality markers such as down toners ('possibly', 'perhaps'), hedges ('kind/sort of', 'somehow'), mental state predicates ('I suppose', 'I think', 'I believe'), or intensifiers ('I'm terribly sorry').

Many researchers have studied apologies, produced by both native and non-native speakers, in different languages. Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper (1989) investigated apologies (and requests) in seven different languages. Their classifications of strategies based on these languages have proven valuable in subsequent treatments of apologies.

**D.5.2 Classroom instruction:**

Three types of materials were used in this study:

1. A series of small data cards which included various apology situations,
2. Model dialogue for role play activities,
3. Feedback and discussion.

A series of small cards were designed based on different apology situations. These apology situations were written in accordance with an archetypal apology situation applied in Cohen and Olshtain (1981). They were as follows:

1. Insulting someone at a meeting.
2. Forgetting to take your son shopping.
3. Forgetting a meeting with your boss.
4. Forgetting a meeting with a friend.
5. Backing into a car.
6. Bumping a lady, spilling package and hurting her.
7. Bumping a lady, shaking her up.
8. Bumping a lady, because she is in the way.
9. Damaging a beautiful dress and make it dirty.
10. Damaging a beautiful dress and make it torn.

Each situation in the small cards was taught one by one explicitly to the Select Group and comprehensive explanations which demonstrate strategies of apology in English are presented. The required output was role-played by students or teacher for each situation on the card to reinforce the material.

The teacher as well as the students, role played the dialogues to elaborate the situation based on the above apology situations. At the first stage of using dialogues, students listened to and identified the apology. Then they were given the dialogues without the
information concerning the particular situation, and they had to try and guess if the people speaking know each other, if they are of the same age, and whether they were apologizing for some serious offense. For example

1. **Student A:** You haven’t finished the report that you had to finish by the end of the day yesterday.

   **Student B:** You are Student A’s boss

2. **Student A:** You are waiting to go out with your boyfriend/girlfriend tonight.

   **Student B:** You are phoning to say you can’t make it and have to cancel the date.

These considerations, which could be discussed in groups, helped students become sensitive to social and pragmatic factors that affect speech acts. Such model dialogues could focus on the distinction between “I’m sorry” and “Excuse me” or other appropriate choices of a strategies or any other element of the apology act. The dialogues were read by the teacher (researcher) two or three times. Then the teacher or the students, role played the dialogues. The model dialogues and role play activities were directed only to the explicit teaching group to reinforce the replies and situations. Thus, for an apology situation, the students in explicit teaching group received cards, with a picture on some of them and some notes mentioned about an offensive apology realization. The students were directed to think of a potential violation that might have been occurred, in the sense
that, first, one student is the offender/apologizer and then the other is placed in the same role. In this way, each student has been in the both roles.

The rationale behind this was to minimize the misunderstanding and maximize the reliability as well as the validity problems caused by the language factor (Geisinger, 1994). Before carrying out the treatment students were given the apology situations. The data were collected and the frequency and percentage of the occurrence of intensifiers and different types of semantic formulas were computed. Feedback and discussion were the last activity used for explicit group. The nature of these discussions was mostly a dialogic one, between the teacher and students. Sometimes, for better understanding L1 was used to get the intended meaning across.

**DAY 6: COMPLAINTS**

**D.6.1 Explanation:**

Al-Tayib Umar (2006) describes complaint as an expression of a psychological state of being dissatisfied or unhappy about something. As Tanck (2002) remarks that, the speech act of complaint occurs when a speaker reacts with displeasure or annoyance to an action that has affected him/her in an unfavorable manner. Furthermore, Al-Tayib Umar (2006: 8-40) explains Olshtain and Weinback's (1987) specified necessary preconditions for the speech act of complaint:

(i) The speaker expects a favorable event to occur (an appointment, the return of a debt, the fulfillment of a promise, etc), or an unfavorable event to be prevented from occurring,
(a damage, an insult etc), the action results, therefore, in the violation of speaker's expectations by either having enabled or failed to prevent the offensive event.

(ii) The speaker sees an action as having unfavorable consequences for him/her-self. The action is therefore the offensive act.

(iii) The speaker holds the hearer responsible for the action.

(iv) The speaker chooses to express his/her dissatisfaction and frustration verbally.

As Moon (2001) remarks that it is generally agreed that the speech act of complaint is face threatening to the hearer. When the speaker makes direct complaints, he/she is more likely to threat the hearer's face, or hurt his/her feelings and hence spoil the relationship between them.

According to Sauer (2000), speakers may tend to use a variety of linguistic forms and nonverbal signals in order to save the hearer's face and remain polite even when performing the inherently face-threatening speech act of complaint. Of course, this requires a higher level of pragmatic competence.

**D.6.2 Classroom instruction:**

Four types of materials were used in this study:

1. A series of small data cards which included various complaint situations,
2. Model dialogue for role play activities,
3. Task for diagnostic assessment (A collection of different complaint situations)
4. Feedback and discussion.
A series of small cards were designed based on different complaint situations. They were as follow:

1. Complaining about the channel transmission to your cable operator
2. Complaining to your teacher about your classmate's misbehavior
3. Complaining to your boss about your colleague for his misbehavior
4. Complaining to your principal about poor light in the classroom
5. Complaining to a stranger for parking a car in the middle of yours.
6. Complaining to your friend's mother about your for damaging a beautiful dress of yours and making it dirty.
7. Complaining to the shop owner for giving you a wrong umbrella and not that was purchased.

In each situation the small cards were taught one by one explicitly for the experimental group and comprehensive explanations which demonstrate strategies of apology in English are presented. The required output was role-played by students or teacher for each situation on the card to reinforce the material.

The teacher as well as the students, role played the dialogues to elaborate the situation based on the above complaint situations. At the first stage of using dialogues, students listened to and identified the complaint by reviewing the questions like as follows:

1. Under what circumstances is it necessary for you to make complaints?
2. According to your understanding of the Indian culture (e.g. contacts with people or watching movies), do you think people make complaints in similar situations as it happens in the movies?

3. When making complaints, do personal factors such as age, gender, social status, and degree of intimacy of the hearer make any difference to you in the choice of language? If so, which factor(s) do you think would affect your speech the most?

4. Are the same factors determine your making complaints in English?

These considerations, which could be discussed in groups, helped students become sensitive to social and pragmatic factors that affect speech acts. Such model dialogues could focus on the distinction between “I’m sorry” and “Excuse me” or other appropriate choices of a strategies or any other element of the complaining act. The dialogues were read by the teacher (researcher) two or three times. Then the teacher or the students, role played the dialogues. The model dialogues and role play activities were directed only to the explicit teaching group to reinforce the replies and situations. The students were directed to think of a potential violation that might have been occurred, in the sense that, first, one student is the complainer/complainant and then the other is placed in the same role. In this way, each student has been in the both roles.

The task which was used in this study was composed of a set of complaint situations. They were asked to indicate the appropriate level of agreement with regard to each question by writing the answers on the paper. The questionnaire that was used was:
1. Imagine that your neighbour is playing a loud music during late hours in the night and you are getting disturbed. You want to tell him to reduce the volume. How would you tell him to reduce the volume without hurting him? Please write your response.

2. Your neighbour has parked the car in the middle of the road and you want to take your vehicle out. You are quite annoyed by your neighbour’s way of parking his car. How would request/complaint to him to remove his vehicle?

3. You need to buy a ticket to travel to a nearby city to visit your family over the weekend. You go to the ticket office at the bus station and you have to wait in a long line to get a ticket. The tickets are almost sold out. You have been waiting there for more than an hour. While you are standing in line, someone about your age, tries to cut in line in front of you.

4. You are applying for a position with a highly reputed company. The interview committee wants to have a recommendation letter from your employer. Your boss agrees to send this letter directly to the company. A month later you discover that the committee has not received this letter. You go to your boss's office to find out what has happened.

Feedback and discussion were the last activity used for explicit group. The nature of these discussions was mostly a dialogic one, between the teacher and students.

**DAY 7: COMPLIMENT AND COMPLIMENT RESPONSE**

**D.7.1 Explanation:**
Compliments primarily aim at maintaining, enhancing, or supporting the addressee’s face (Goffman, 1967) and are used for a variety of reasons, the most significant of which is perhaps to express admiration or approval of someone’s work/appearance/taste. Basing on several socio-pragmatic studies (Wolfson, 1981, 1984; Manes & Wolfson, 1980; Wolfson & Manes, 1980; Herbert, 1991; Holmes 1988), it is clear that compliments are routine formulae and are used with a few syntactic patterns and a limited vocabulary that are instrumental in the expression of appreciation and praise. However, there is a need to be raised to question this claim: firstly, as Pomerantz (1978) maintains, compliments put forward a severe problem for the addressee, that is, how to make up the need to be supportive of the speaker and to keep off self-praise. Moreover, it might also be debated that compliments, although are primarily polite speech acts or “face flattering acts” (cf. Manno, 2005), can make complimentees feel embarrassed, thereby creating a threat for their negative face. Thirdly, it is apparent that speech acts like compliments are subject to sociolinguistic and cultural variations (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989). As a result, macroscopic cultural and linguistic differences in the giving and accepting of compliments can be observed across languages. Certain cultures are considerably more prone to complimenting than others, or they may prefer more indirect means of performing speech acts such as, for instance, expressing praise. This might be the case in English, a language where negative face work plays a crucial role and that has been described as a splendid mode for mitigation and understatement. On considering all these aspects, the researcher supports the assumption that implicit compliments, i.e. more concealed forms that do not look like compliments on the surface level, cannot only solve
the dilemma that Pomerantz (1978) illustrated, but come out to be more efficient strategies as they are largely more respectful of the complimentee’s territory and relaxes the pressure on his/her negative face.

The compliment response strategies developed by Giao Quynh Tran (2003c) are used in the classification framework, which are placed on the acceptance to denial continuum with compliment upgrade at one end and disagreement at the other. The following are the proposed continua together with the definition and example of each strategy. They are among the collected data. The underlined words in each example represent the compliment response strategy that the example illustrates. In the examples, A represents the complimenter and B the complimentee.

(Specimen examples adapted from Billmyer (1990:36) used while teaching)

**Compliment Upgrade:** The complimentee agrees with and increases the complimentary force.

*A:* Nice T.V set!

*B:* Thanks. Brand new.

**Agreement:** The complimentee agrees with the complimentary force by providing a response which is semantically fitted to the compliment.

*A:* Hey you’re looking really beautiful today.

*B:* Yeah I’m happy to say that that’s correct.

**Appreciation:** The complimentee shows appreciation for the interlocutor’s previous utterance as a compliment.
A: *What a lovely dress!*

B: *Oh. Thank you. I am glad you say so.*

**Return:** The complimentee reciprocates the act of complimenting by saying the compliment back to the complimenter.

A: *You’re looking good.*

B: *Thanks. So are you.*

**Compliment Downgrade:** The complimentee qualifies or downplays the compliment force

A: *It’s a really nice car.*

B: *Oh no. It looks like that but actually it has a lot of problems.*

**Disagreement:** The complimentee thinks the compliment is overdone, and therefore directly disagrees with it.

A: *You’re looking brilliant.*

B: *Oh. No, I don’t think so.*

A: *Nice Shirt!*

B: *No it's not really that nice.*

**D.7.2 Classroom instruction:**

Four types of materials and instrument were used in this study:

1. A series of small data cards which included various compliment and compliment situations,

2. Model dialogue for role play activities,
3. Task for diagnostic assessment (A collection of different complaint situations)

4. Feed back and discussion.

A series of small cards were designed based on different compliment and compliment response situations. They were as follow:

1. Complimenting your colleague for his presentation at a meeting.
2. Responding to your colleague's compliment for your presentation.
3. Complimenting your boss for his success.
4. Complimenting your friend for his achievement in the exam
5. Responding to a compliment given by your friend to you for your success in the exam
6. Complimenting an old lady at the park for her wearing a nice saree
7. Complimenting your teacher for his lecture on your favourite topic.
8. Responding to a compliment for your lecture given by a student if you were a teacher

In each situation the small cards were taught one by one explicitly for the experimental group and comprehensive explanations which demonstrate compliments and compliment responses. The required output was role-played by students or teacher for each situation on the card to reinforce the material.

The teacher as well as the students, role played the dialogues to elaborate the situation based on the above compliment and compliment response situations. The model dialogues and role play activities were directed only to the explicit teaching group to reinforce the replies and situations. The students were directed to think of a potential violation that might have been occurred, in the sense that, first, one student is the
compliment giver/compliment receiver and then the other is placed in the same role. In this way, each student has been in both roles.

The task which was used in this study was composed of a set of compliment/compliment response situations. They were asked to indicate the appropriate level of agreement with regard to each question by writing the answers on the paper. The questions used were:

1. Your teacher has just finished the class on Speech Acts. You enjoyed the class and you would like to compliment him. How would you compliment him?
   If you are being complimented for the above stated situation, how would you respond?

2. Your friend in the hostel has bought a new shirt. How would you compliment him?
   If you are being complimented for the same, how would you respond?

3. Your teacher has worn a nice saree and you want to compliment her for her nice saree. How would you compliment her?
   If you are being complimented for the same, how would you respond?

Feedback and discussion were the last activity used for explicit group.

**DAY 8: REQUESTS**

**D.8.1 Explanation:**

One of the most frequently occurring speech acts across cultures, and one of the most researched as well, is the request. Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper (1989) devoted a large portion of their edited volume to studying the pragmatics of the request speech act. By way of their research, they developed a process for designing appropriate data
induction tests and created a detailed coding manual to assist in examining discourse data.

Additional work in this area of pragmatics research has focused on the instruction of requests. Rose (1999:171) provided a report of the successful instruction of requests as

...inductive approaches to developing awareness of how language forms are used appropriately in context. The aim is not to teach explicitly the various means of... performing a given speech act... but, rather, to expose learners to the pragmatic aspects of language... and provide them with the analytical tools they need to arrive at their own generalizations concerning contextually appropriate language use.

D.8.2 Classroom instruction:

Four types of materials and instrument were used in this study:

1. A series of small data cards which included various request situations

2. Model dialogue for role play activities,

3. Task for diagnostic assessment (A collection of different request situations)

4. Feed back and discussion.

A series of small cards were designed based on different compliment and compliment response situations. They were as follow:

1. Requesting your friend to accompany you for shopping.

2. Requesting your brother to reduce to volume of TV while you were studying.

3. Requesting your teacher to repeat some part of his lecture that you couldn't understand.

4. Requesting your mother to help you in choosing a dress for a party.

5. Requesting the librarian of your college to lend you one extra book.
6. Requesting your teacher to help you in preparing for a class presentation.

In each situation the small cards were taught one by one explicitly for the experimental group and comprehensive explanations which demonstrate requests. The required output was role-played by students or teacher for each situation on the card to reinforce the material.

The teacher as well as the students, role played the dialogues to elaborate the situation based on the above request situations. The model dialogues and role play activities were directed only to the explicit teaching group to reinforce the replies and situations. The students were directed to think of a potential violation that might have been occurred.

The task which was used in this study was composed of a set of request situations. They were asked to indicate the appropriate level of agreement with regard to each situation by writing the answers on the paper. The situations that were used were:

**Situation 1:** You both work in a tiles factory. One of you is a secretary who needs two days off because his/her mother is ill.

**Situation 2:** You are two friends; one of you wants the other to ask the teacher a question about vocabulary, because there is a word s/he does not understand, but s/he is not very good at English.

**Situation 3:** You have forgotten your purse, and you need to do some Xeroxes for next class. Ask your classmate to lend you some money.

**Situation 4:** You have been waiting for the bus for almost half an hour. A person arrives at the bus stop. Ask him/her for information.
Situation 5: There is plenty of work at your office this weekend, but it is also your Sister's wedding. Ask your boss for a morning off.

Feedback and discussion were the last activity used for the Select Group.

DAY 9: HEDGES

D.9.1 Explanation:

Verschueren (2000:55) claims that “using language must consist of the continuous making of linguistic choices”, and the utterer makes choices in different levels is for the adjustment with the contextual correlatives till come on some satisfied communicative effects. It is doubtless that choice-making and adjustments are the keys of the communication stream.

In order to keep a good relationship between interlocutors, and make the conversation go on peacefully, utterers need to choose various communicative strategies to maintain the face of both sides. Brown and Levinson (1987:61) define “face” as the “public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself”, which consists of two related aspects: positive face and negative face. The former one means “the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others”. The latter one refers to “the want of every competent adult member that his action be unimpeded by others”. Being polite means the observing both the negative and positive face needs. According to them, face preservation is a key factor affecting communication.

D.9.2 Classroom instruction:
Four types of materials and instrument were used in this study:

1. A series of small data cards which included various dialogues between A & B
2. Pair works to analyze the exchanges,
3. Task for diagnostic assessment (A collection of different contexts)
4. Feed back and discussion.

A series of small cards were designed based on hedges used in the utterances. They were as follow:

1. *He is a slightly* stupid person.
2. *There might just be a few* insignificant problems we need to address.
3. *The party was somewhat* spoiled by the return of the parents.
4. *I'm not an expert* but you might want to try restarting your computer.
5. *All I know is,* smoking is harmful to your health.
6. *I am sorry to trouble you but* do you have time?
7. *It was a kind of a* bang
8. *She's sort of* pretty
9. *They told me that* they are married.
10. *I am not sure if all of these are clear to you, but* this is what I know.

In each dialogue in the small cards were taught one by one explicitly to the Select Group and explained the hedges used before an utterance. The teacher as well as the students discussed the utterances to elaborate the situation. The model dialogues and role play activities were directed to the Select Group to reinforce the utterances and context.
The task which was used in this study was composed of set utterances. The learners were asked to indicate the appropriate hedge used with regard to each context by writing the answers on the paper. The utterances used were:

1. All I know is, smoking is harmful to your health.

The task was then explained by the researcher in detail in the following manner for each of the utterances.

(It can be observed that information conveyed by the speaker is limited by adding all I know and as you probably know. By so saying, the speaker wants to inform that s/he is not only making an assertion but observing the maxim of quantity as well.)

2. They told me that they are married.

(If the speaker only says that “they are married” and they do not know for sure if they are married, they may violate the maxim of quality since they say something that they do not know to be true or false. Nevertheless, by adding they told me that, the speaker wants to confirm that they are observing the conversational maxim of quality.)

In conversation, speakers may also be aware of the maxim of manner by producing hedges like:
1. I am not sure if all of these are clear to you, but this is what I know.

(This particular example shows that hedges are good indications the speakers are not only conscious of the maxim of manner, but they are also trying to observe them.)

2. By the way, you like this car?

(By using *by the way*, what has been said by the speakers is not relevant to the moment in which the conversation takes place. Such a hedge can be found in the middle of speakers’ conversation as the speaker wants to switch to another topic that is different from the previous one. Therefore, *by the way* functions as a hedge indicating that the speaker wants to drift into another topic or want to stop the previous topic.)

Task for diagnostic assessment was given to the learners for putting hedges back by adding one or more of the following words or phrases to the following sentences:

*I think (that), kind of, just, a little (bit), slightly, essentially, might, almost, partially*

1. The desire to make it urban is disappointing.

2. By assigning it this monumental presence of circulation in the building, you’re limiting yourself.

3. What you need is a clearer frame.

4. You know we could leave this out.
5. It’s ironic that you choose the military as the example.

6. I think you want to probe deeper into this.

7. I wonder if you wouldn’t want to locate it historically more precisely.

8. I’m looking for something more on the technical side.

9. Let’s just leave that vague right now.

10. Housing costs have gone up so much that it’s an unfightable battle.

Feedback and discussion were the last activity used for the Select Group.

**DAY 10: SEARLE'S TYPOLOGY OF SPEECH ACT FUNCTIONS AND AUSTIN'S FELICITY CONDITIONS**

**D.10.1 Explanation:**

Austin (1963:22) identifies three distinct levels of action beyond the act of utterance. He distinguishes the act of saying something, what one does in saying it, and what one does by saying it and calls them as the locutionary, the illocutionary and the perlocutionary act respectively.

As Mey (1993:111-112) remarks that "Speech acts are actions happening in the world, that is, they bring about a change in the existing state of affairs." He further states that it is an act that a speaker performs when making an utterance, including the following:

(i) a general act that a speaker performs, analyzable as including

   a) the uttering of words (utterance acts)
b) making reference and predicating (propositional acts), and

c) a particular intention in making the utterance (illocutionary force)

(ii) an act involved in the illocutionary act, including utterance acts and propositional acts

(iii) the production of a particular effect in the addressee (perlocutionary act)

As Austin (1975) remarks that in performing a locutionary act one also be performing acts such as:

(i) asking or answering a question;

(ii) giving some information or an assurance or a warning;

(iii) announcing a verdict or an intention;

(iv) pronouncing sentence;

(v) making an appointment or an appeal or a criticism;

(vi) making an identification or giving a description.

While trying to establish the differences between the different speech acts as proposed by Austin, one discovers that there are many levels at which speech acts can differ. Searle (1977:27) puts it as follows:

... there are several quite different principles of distinction: that is, there are different kinds of difference that enables us to say that the force of this utterance is different from the force of that utterance.

The five categories that Searle (1977:34) establishes are:
(i) **representative** = speech acts that commit a speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition, e.g. reciting a creed

(ii) **directives** = speech acts that are to cause the hearer to take a particular action, e.g. requests, commands and advice

(iii) **commissives** = speech acts that commit a speaker to some future action, e.g. promises and oaths

(iv) **expressives** = speech acts that express the speaker's attitudes and emotions towards the proposition, e.g. congratulations, excuses and thanks

(v) **declarations** = speech acts that change the reality in accord with the proposition of the declaration, e.g. baptisms, pronouncing someone guilty or pronouncing someone husband and wife

Thus, both Austin and Searle operate on the 'one sentence-one case principle'
(Mey, 1993)

There are a few appropriate circumstances for the performances of a speech act to be recognized as intended are known as *felicity conditions*. In Austin's (1956) formulation of Speech act theory, a performative utterance is neither true nor false, but can instead be deemed "felicitous" or "infelicitous", in other words, "happy" or "unhappy" according to a set of conditions whose interpretation differs depending on whether the utterance in question is a declaration ("I sentence you to death"), a request ("I ask that you stop doing..."
that") or a warning ("I warn you not to jump off the roof"). Austin (1965:14-15) describes felicity conditions in the following manner:

(1a) There must exist an accepted conventional procedure having a certain conventional effect, that procedure to include the uttering of certain words by certain persons in certain circumstances, and further,

(1b) the particular persons and circumstances in a given case must be appropriate for the invocation of the particular procedure involved.

(2a) The procedure must be executed by all participants both correctly and

(2b) completely.

(3a) Where, as often, the procedure is designed for use by persons having certain thoughts or feelings, or for the inauguration of certain consequential conduct on the part of any participant, then a person participating in and so invoking the procedure must in fact have those thoughts or feelings, and the participants must intend so to conduct themselves, and further

(3b) must actually so conduct themselves subsequently.

Austin (1962) explains the conditions as follows:
Felicity conditions for declarations

- *Conventionality of procedure*: the procedure (e.g. an oath) follows its conventional form
- *Appropriate participants and circumstances*: the participants are able to perform a felicitous speech act under the specific circumstances (e.g. a judge can sentence a criminal in court, but not on the street)
- *Complete execution*: the speaker completes the speech act without errors or interruptions
- *Sincerity condition*: the utterance counts as the speaker's will

Felicity conditions for requests

- *Propositional content condition*: the requested act is a future act of the hearer
- *Preparatory precondition*: 1) the speaker believes the hearer can perform the requested act; 2) it is not obvious that the hearer would perform the requested act without being asked
- *Sincerity condition*: the speaker genuinely wants the hearer to perform the requested act
- *Essential condition*: the utterance counts as an attempt by the speaker to have the hearer do an act
Felicity conditions for warnings

- **Propositional content condition**: it is a future event
- **Preparatory precondition**: 1) the speaker believes the event will occur and be detrimental to the hearer; 2) the speaker believes that it is not obvious to the hearer that the event will occur
- **Sincerity condition**: the speaker genuinely believes that the event will be detrimental to the hearer
- **Essential condition**: the utterance counts as an attempt by the speaker to have the hearer recognize that a future event will be detrimental

D.10.2 Classroom instruction:

Four types of materials were used in this study:

1. A series of small data cards which included utterances pertaining to the functions of the speech acts
2. An exercise on Match the following
3. Exercise on Felicity conditions
4. Feed back and discussion.

A series of small cards were designed based on functions of Speech acts. They were as follow:

- *I think tigers are nearly extinct* (assertives)
- *Would you open the window, please?* (directives)
- *I promise I'll do my homework* (commissives)
I don't believe this crap! (expressives)

The court declares the defendant not guilty (declaratives)

Each utterance in the small cards was taught one by one to the Select Group and was explained to them the five types of general functions performed by speech acts.

The teacher as well as the students discussed the above mentioned categories to elaborate the functions of the speech acts in the examples given. The model utterances were directed to the Select Group to reinforce the replies and context.

The researcher provided the learners with an exercise on match the following type where the learners are expected to match the person with the utterance under the felicity conditions.

1. I hereby pronounce you wife and husband                         Referee
2. I hereby sentence you to 5 yrs imprisonment                     Minister
3. I hereby name the ship Elizabeth                                        Priest
4. I hereby baptize you John                                                   Doctor
5. I hereby declare the match draw                                        Registrar
6. I hereby declare the patient to be dead                              Judge

Each of the above utterances was described and discussed the felicity conditions that are required to make an utterance.

An exercise on Felicity conditions was taken up by the researcher for the learners to explain the conditions and procedure for the felicity condition to be successful.
1. What are conditions and procedures required for the Priest to say, “I hereby baptize you John”.

2. What are conditions and procedures required for the Referee to say, “I hereby declare the match draw.”

3. What are conditions and procedures required for the Doctor to say, “I hereby declare the patient to be dead.”

Feedback and discussion were the last activity used for the Select Group.

Thus, are the materials used by the researcher to implement in the teacher fronted classroom teaching.

3.2.3 DATA COLLECTION

After the pragmatic treatment the posttest was administered and the results would be used to compare the results of pretest and posttest (See Chapter 4 Table 1). The analysis of the data would be is dealt with in the following chapter.