

**An Investigation of EFL Learners' Interlanguage Pragmatics
in Expression of Disagreement**



Submitted by

Samina Ali Asghar

Id:100884020

M. Phil. Applied Linguistics

Department of English Language and Literature

School of Social Sciences and Humanities

University of Management and Technology Lahore

2014

An Investigation of EFL Learners' Interlanguage
Pragmatics in Expression of Disagreement

By

Samina Ali Asghar

M. Phil. Applied Linguistics

This research was submitted to University of Management and Technology, Lahore in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Degree of M.Phil. Applied Linguistics

Department of English Language and Literature
School of Social Sciences and Humanities
University of Management and Technology Lahore
2014

Abstract

The present study is a survey based cross sectional study of the investigation of EFL learners' inter-language pragmatics in expression of disagreement. Expressing disagreement is one of those speech acts which are commonly used in every day interaction in every language.

However, EFL learners, sometimes face problem in the use of this speech act appropriately which often causes communication breakdown between native speakers of a language and EFL learners. The objectives of the study are: (a) to identify communicative strategies used by EFL learners of Pakistan in English language in showing disagreement; (b) To find out the similarities and differences of politeness strategies used by Pakistani EFL learners and British English speakers in the realization of speech act of disagreement; (c) to identify the extent to which Pakistani EFL learners' pragmatic competence is towards or away from target language; (d) to reveal the influence of contextual variables on the speakers' expression of disagreement.

The present study was carried out on sample of two hundred speakers i.e. one hundred British English speakers and one hundred Pakistani EFL learners from four universities i.e. University of Glasgow, Glasgow; Institute of Education, London, University of Management and Technology, Lahore and Government College University, Lahore.

The data were collected by using discourse completion test. Responses of subjects were classified into five disagreement strategies by applying taxonomy proposed by Muntigl and Turnbull (1998). Moreover, data were analyzed by using model of politeness presented by Brown and Levinson (1987). Descriptive statistics was used to identify pragmatic differences which differentiated behavior of the two groups.

The results showed that English native speakers and Pakistani EFL learners applied same types of disagreement expressions and politeness strategies but their preferences of strategies were different in ten situations. They were significantly different in their use of strategies. Native speakers of English were more indirect in their expressions as compared to EFL learners. Gender did not influence the choices of strategies used by both of the groups. In addition, contextual variables such as social status, social distance and level of formality, had a significant effect on the use of strategies for both of the groups.

Certificate of Approval

The dissertation entitled "An Investigation of EFL Learners' Interlanguage Pragmatics in Expression of Disagreement" submitted by Samina Ali Asghar bearing Roll # 100884020 has been accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of MPhil in Applied Linguistics by the Department of English Language and Literature, School of Social Sciences and Humanities, University of Management and Technology, Lahore.

Prof. Rao Jalceel Ahmed
Supervisor



Prof. Zamir Naqvi
External Examiner



Prof. Rao Jalceel Ahmed
Chairman



Dr. Abdul Hameed
Dean

Date: 22-05-2014

Acknowledgement

I am thankful to Almighty Allah for giving me courage and ability to do this project and respect for the last Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) Whose spiritual teachings enlighten the hearts and minds towards achieving higher ideas of life. Then I am thankful to Associate professor Rao Jaleel Sahib whose kind guidance, insight, inspiration, motivation and suggestions made it possible for me to complete this research work successfully.

Samina Ali Asghar

Table of contents

	Topic	
	Content	Page
Abstract	I
Approval Certificate	Iii
Acknowledgement		Iv
List of contents	V
List of Figure	Viii
List of Tables	Xi
Chapter 1		1
	INTRODUCTION	
	1.1 Statement of the Problem	8
	1.2 Objectives of the study	9
	1.3 Research Questions	9
	1.4 Significance of the Study	10
	1.5 Delimitation of the Study	10
Chapter 2		11
	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	
	2.1 Communicative Competence	11
	2.1.1 Grammatical Competence	12
	2.1.2 Sociolinguistic Competence	12
	2.1.3 Strategic Competence	13
	2.1.4 Discourse Competence	13
	2.2 Pragmatics	14
	2.3 Interlanguage Pragmatics	15
	2.4 Pragmatic Transfer	17
	2.5 Acquisition of L1 and L2 Pragmatic Competence	18
	2.6 Reasons for Pragmatic Error	19
	2.7 Critical Period and Pragmatic Competence	19

2.8	Richer Input and Pragmatic Competence	20
2.9	Theories of Pragmatics	20
2.9.1	Speech Act Theory	20
2.9.1.1	Three Dimension Speech Acts	21
2.9.1.1.1	Illocutionary Act	22
2.9.1.2	Disagreement: An Illocutionary Act	23
2.10	Indirectness and Disagreement	24
2.10.1	Indirectness	24
2.10.1.1	Indirectness in Speech Acts	25
2.10.1.1.1	Conventional Indirectness	26
2.10.1.1.2	Non –Conventional Indirectness	26
2.10.1.2	Factors Influencing Indirectness	27
2.11	Indirectness and Politeness	27
2.12	Politeness	30
2.13	Approaches to Politeness	31
2.13.1	Volitional Approach	31
2.13.1.1	Grice’s Cooperative Principle	31
2.13.1.2	Lakoff’s Rules of Politeness	32
2.13.1.3	Leech’s Maxims	33
2.13.1.4	Brown and Levinson’s Model of Politeness	33
2.13.1.4.1	Strategies for Doing FTAs	35
2.13.1.4.1.1	Bald on Record Strategies	35
2.13.1.4.1.2	On - Record Strategies	36
2.13.1.4.1.3	Off- Record Strategies	37
2.13.1.4.1.4	No FTA	38
2.13.1.5	Fraser and Nolen’s Politeness Approach	39
2.13.1.6	Watts’ (1989) Approach to Politeness	39
2.13.2	Normative Approach to Politeness	39
2.13.2.1	Chinese Research	40
2.13.2.2	Japanese Research	40
2.13.2.3	Other Non- Anglophone Research	42
2.13.3	Synthetic Approach to Politeness	42
2.14	Politeness Theory and Disagreement	43
2.15	Disagreement as a Dispreferred or Preferred Act	44

	2.16	Influence of Contextual Variables on Disagreement	44
	2.17	Research in L1 and Speech Act of Disagreement	45
	2.18	Cross - Cultural Studies and Speech Act of Disagreement	46
	2.19	Linguistics Disagreement Strategies	48
	2.20	Non –Linguistic Disagreement strategies	50
Chapter 3		METHOD AND PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY	52
	3.1	Nature of the Study	52
	3.2	Population	52
	3.3	Sampling	52
	3.4	Data Collection Instrument	53
	3.4.1	Demographic Survey	54
	3.4.2	Discourse Completion Test	54
	3.4.2.1	Rationale for Using Discourse Completion Test	54
	3.5	Procedure of Data Collection	57
	3.5.1	Administering Questionnaire	57
	3.6	Data Analysis	57
Chapter 4		DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATIONS	59
Chapter 5		DISCUSSION, FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	110
	5.1	Discussion	110
	5.2	Findings	115
	5.3	Conclusion	122
	5.4	Recommendations	124
	5.5	Recommendations for further research	124
		REFERENCES	126
		APPENDICES	141

Appendix A	141
Appendix B	142
Appendix C	143
Appendix D	146

List of Figure

Figure	Title	Page
2.1	Components of language competence (Bachman, 1990)	14
2.2	Possible strategies for doing FTAs (Brown and Levinson, 1987)	34
4.1	Comparison between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation I	61
4.2	Comparison between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation II	62
4.3	Comparison between Native speaker and EFL Learner in situation III	63
4.4	Comparison between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation IV	65
4.5	Comparison between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation V	66
4.6	Comparison between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation VI	68
4.7	Comparison between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation VII	69
4.8	Comparison between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation VIII	70
4.9	Comparison between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation IX	72
4.10	Comparison between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation X	73
4.11	Comparison between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation I	75
4.12	Comparison between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation II	76
4.13	Comparison between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation III	77
4.14	Comparison between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation IV	78
4.15	Comparison between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation IV	79
4.16	Comparison between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation VI	80
4.17	Comparison between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation VII	81

4.18	Comparison between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation VIII	82
4.19	Comparison between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation IX	83
4.20	Comparison between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation X	84
4.21	Frequency of strategy of irrelevancy claim used by native speakers and EFL learners according to social status of interlocutors.	93
4.22	Frequency of strategy of contradiction used by native speakers and EFL learners according to social status of interlocutors.	93
4.23	Frequency of strategy of counterclaim used by native speakers and EFL learners according to social status of interlocutors.	94
4.24	Frequency of strategy of act combination used by native speakers and EFL learners according to social status of interlocutors.	94
4.25	Frequency of strategy of message abandonment used by native speakers and EFL learners according to social status of interlocutors.	95
4.26	Frequency of strategy of bald on record without redressive action by used native speakers and EFL learners according to social status of interlocutors.	96
4.27	Frequency of strategy of bald on record with redressive action used by native speakers and EFL learners according to social status of interlocutors.	97
5.28	Frequency of strategy of off record used by native speakers and EFL learners according to social status of interlocutors.	97
4.29	Frequency of strategy of No FTA used by native speakers and EFL learners according to social status of interlocutors.	99
4.30	Frequency of strategy of irrelevancy claim used by native speakers and EFL learners according to social distance of interlocutors.	99
4.31	Frequency of strategy of challenge used by native speakers and EFL learners according to social distance of interlocutors.	99
4.32	Frequency of strategy of contradiction used by native speakers and EFL learners according to social distance of interlocutors.	100
4.33	Frequency of strategy of counterclaim used by native speakers and EFL learners according to social distance of interlocutors.	100
4.34	Frequency of strategy of act combination used by native speakers and EFL learners according to social distance of interlocutors.	100
4.35	Frequency of strategy of message abandonment used by native speakers and EFL learners according to social distance of interlocutors.	101

4.36	Frequency of strategy of bald on record used by native speakers and EFL learners according to social distance of interlocutors.	102
4.37	Frequency of strategy of on record with redressive action used by native speakers and EFL learners according to social distance of interlocutors.	103
4.38	Frequency of strategy of off record used by native speakers and EFL learners according to social distance of interlocutors.	103
4.39	Frequency of strategy of no FTA used by native speakers and EFL learners according to social distance of interlocutors.	103
4.40	Frequency of strategy of irrelevancy claim used by native speakers and EFL learners according to level of formality between speakers.	105
4.41	Frequency of strategy of challenge used by native speakers and EFL learners according to level of formality between speakers.	105
4.42	Frequency of strategy of contradiction used by native speakers and EFL learners according to level of formality between speakers.	106
4.43	Frequency of strategy of counterclaim used by native speakers and EFL learners according to level of formality between speakers.	106
4.44	Frequency of strategy of act combination used by native speakers and EFL learners according to level of formality between speakers.	106
4.45	Frequency of strategy of message abandonment by native speakers and EFL learners according to level of formality between speakers.	107
4.46	Frequency of strategy of bald on record by native speakers and EFL learners according to level of formality between speakers.	108
4.47	Frequency of strategy of on record with redressive action by native speakers and EFL learners according to level of formality between speakers.	109
4.48	Frequency of strategy of off record used by native speakers and EFL learners according to level of formality between speakers.	109
4.49	Frequency of strategy of no FTA by used native speakers and EFL learners according to level of formality between speakers.	109

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Title	Page
2.1	The five general functions of speech acts (Yule, 1996)	23
3.1	Sample size of EFL Learners (Non- native speakers of English Language)	53
3.2	Sample size of British Speakers (Native Speakers of English Language)	53
3.3	Definition of Contextual Variables	56
3.4	Interpretation of Kappa	58
4.1	Percentage distribution of participant by gender, age and institute	61
4.2	Association between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation I	62
4.3	Association between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation II	63
4.4	Association between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation III	64
4.5	Association between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation IV	65
4.6	Association between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation V	67
4.7	Association between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation VI	68
4.8	Association between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation VII	69
4.9	Association between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation VIII	70
4.10	Association between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation IX	71
4.11	Association between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation X	72
4.12	Association between Native speakers and EFL Learner in all situations	74
4.13	Association between Native speakers and EFL Learner in using politeness devices situation 1	74
4.14	Association between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation II	75
4.15	Association between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation III	76
4.16	Association between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation IV	77

4.17	Association between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation V	78
4.18	Association between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation VI	79
4.19	Association between Native speakers and EFL Learners in situation VII	80
4.20	Association between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation VIII	81
4.21	Association between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation IX	82
4.22	Association between Native speakers and EFL Learner in situation X	83
4.23	Association between Native speakers and EFL Learner in all situations	84
4.24	Agreement between situation I and situation II in expression of disagreement.	85
4.25	Agreement between situation 111 and situation 1V in expression of disagreement	85
4.26	Agreement between situation Vand situation VI in expression of disagreement	86
4.27	Agreement between situation VII and situation VIII in expression of disagreement	86
4.28	Agreement between situation I and situation II in using politeness devices	87
4.29	Agreement between situation 111 and situation 1V in using politeness devices	87
4.30	Agreement between situation V and situation VI in using politeness devices	88
4.31	Agreement between situation VII and situation VIII in using politeness devices	88
4.32	Association between male speakers and Female native speakers in all situations in expression of disagreement	89
4.33	Association between male and Female EFL learners in all situations in expression of disagreement	89
4.34	Association between male speakers and Female native speakers in all situations in implementation of politeness devices	90
4.35	Association between male and Female EFL learners in all situations in use of politeness devices	90
4.36	Influence of social status of interlocutors on the Native speakers' choice of disagreement strategies	92
4.37	Influence of social status of interlocutors on the EFL learners' choice of disagreement strategies	92

4.38	Influence of social status of interlocutors on the Native speakers' us of devices of politeness	95
4.39	Influence of social status of interlocutors on the EFL learners' us of devices of politeness	96
4.40	Influence of social distance of interlocutors on native speakers' choice of disagreement strategies	98
4.41	Influence of social distance of interlocutors on the EFL learners' choice of disagreement strategies	98
4.42	Influence of social distance of interlocutors on the native learners' us of devices of politeness	101
4.43	Influence of social distance of interlocutors on the EFL learners' us of devices of politeness	102
4.44	Influence of formality of interlocutors on the natives' choice of disagreement strategies	104
4.45	Influence of formality of interlocutors on the EFL learners' choice of disagreement strategies	104
4.46	Influence of formality between speakers on the natives' us of devices of politeness	107
4.47	Influence of level of formality between speakers on the EFL learners' us of devices of politeness	108