



**Pragmatic Competence in Requests: A Case of Thai English Teachers**

**Suratchawadee Pinyo**

**A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Master of  
Arts Degree in Teaching English as an International Language**

**Prince of Songkla University**

**2010**

**Copyright of Prince of Songkla University**

**Thesis Title** Pragmatic Competence in Requests: A Case of Thai English Teachers  
**Author** Miss Suratchawadee Pinyo  
**Major Program** Teaching English as an International Language

---

**Major Advisor:**

.....  
(Asst. Prof. Dr. Patama Aksornjarung)

**Examining Committee:**

.....Chairperson  
(Dr. Pittayatorn Kaewkong)

**Co-advisor:**

.....  
(Asst. Prof. Dr. Chonlada Laohawiriyanon)

.....  
(Asst. Prof. Dr. Waraporn Sripetpun)

.....  
(Asst. Prof. Dr. Patama Aksornjarung)

.....  
(Asst. Prof. Dr. Chonlada Laohawiriyanon)

The Graduate School, Prince of Songkla University, has approved this thesis as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts Degree in Teaching English as an International Language.

.....  
(Assoc. Prof. Dr. Krerckchai Thongnoo)  
Dean of Graduate School

ชื่อวิทยานิพนธ์	ความสามารถทางวัจนปฏิบัติศาสตร์ในการขอร้อง กรณีครูไทยสอน ภาษาอังกฤษ
ผู้เขียน	สุรัชวี ภิญโญ
สาขาวิชา	การสอนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษานานาชาติ
ปีการศึกษา	2552

#### บทคัดย่อ

การศึกษานี้มีจุดประสงค์เพื่อ (1) สำนวจความสามารถทางวัจนปฏิบัติศาสตร์ของครูสอนภาษาอังกฤษในการขอร้อง ตอบรับการขอร้อง และปฏิเสธการขอร้อง (2) ศึกษาปัจจัยที่มีอิทธิพลต่อความสามารถทางวัจนปฏิบัติศาสตร์ของกลุ่มตัวอย่าง และ (3) ศึกษาอิทธิพลของสถานะทางสังคมและระยะห่างทางสังคมของกลุ่มสนทนาที่มีต่อคะแนนทดสอบความสามารถด้านการขอร้องของกลุ่มตัวอย่าง กลุ่มตัวอย่างประกอบด้วยครูไทยสอนภาษาอังกฤษจำนวน 29 คน เครื่องมือที่ใช้เก็บข้อมูลมีสามประเภท คือ แบบทดสอบความสามารถทางวัจนปฏิบัติศาสตร์แบบพูด แบบสอบถาม และแบบสัมภาษณ์ โดยให้เจ้าของภาษา (อังกฤษ) ทำคนเป็นผู้ตรวจคำตอบ โดยใช้เกณฑ์การให้คะแนนซึ่งดัดแปลงมาจากเกณฑ์วัดความสามารถทางการสื่อสารของ Cohen และ Olshtain ผลการศึกษาพบว่า (1) คะแนนเฉลี่ยของความสามารถทางวัจนปฏิบัติศาสตร์ของครูสอนภาษาอังกฤษคือ 36.2 จากคะแนนเต็ม 54 คะแนน (67%) คะแนนเฉลี่ยนี้ชี้ให้เห็นว่าความสามารถทางวัจนปฏิบัติศาสตร์ของครูอยู่ในระดับปานกลาง ซึ่งเป็นระดับที่เพียงพอต่อการสื่อสารในสถานการณ์ที่กำหนดให้เท่านั้น นอกจากนี้ผลการวิเคราะห์ความแปรปรวนทางเดียว (One-way ANOVA) ไม่พบความแตกต่างอย่างมีนัยสำคัญทางสถิติระหว่างชนิดของการขอร้อง ทั้งนี้ปัจจัยสำคัญที่ทำให้ครูกลุ่มนี้ไม่บรรลุถึงความสามารถระดับสูงด้านวัจนปฏิบัติศาสตร์ประกอบด้วย การขาดความรู้ด้านวัจนปฏิบัติศาสตร์ การถ่ายโอนจากภาษาแม่ และการขาดความสามารถด้านการใช้ภาษา (2) ความสามารถด้านภาษาศาสตร์และความสามารถทางวัจนปฏิบัติศาสตร์มีความสัมพันธ์เชิงบวกในระดับต่ำ และพบว่าทักษะการอ่านและการเขียนภาษาอังกฤษที่ครูสอนมีความสัมพันธ์ในทางลบกับความสามารถทางวัจนปฏิบัติศาสตร์ของครู (3) สถานะทางสังคมและระยะห่างทางสังคมของกลุ่มสนทนาไม่มีอิทธิพลต่อคำพูดของครูผู้ให้ข้อมูล ข้อเสนอแนะจากงานวิจัยนี้คือ ครูสอนภาษาอังกฤษควรได้รับการฝึกฝนด้านภาษาและวัจนปฏิบัติศาสตร์ทั้งระดับกว้างและระดับลึก

Thesis Title	Pragmatic Competence in Requests: A Case of Thai English Teachers
Author	Suratchawadee Pinyo
Major Program	Teaching English as an International Language
Academic Year	2009

### **ABSTRACT**

The present research was carried out to: (1) investigate the pragmatic competence of Thai English teachers in making, accepting, and declining requests, (2) to study the factors influencing the subjects' pragmatic competence, and (3) to examine the influence of the interlocutor's social status and social distance on the utterances made by the participants. The participants were 29 Thai English teachers. Data were collected through three sets of instrument: oral discourse completion test (ODCT), questionnaire, and interview. Five English native speakers rated the test according to scoring criteria adapted from the Cohen and Olshtain Communicative Ability Scales. It was found in this study that (1) the mean score for the pragmatic competence of the Thai English teachers in the three aspects of requests was 36.24 out of 54 (67%). This figure indicated that the pragmatic competence of the teachers was at a moderate level, the level adequate for communication in the given contexts. In addition, one-way ANOVA showed no significant difference between the types of requests. Three potential causes for the teachers' lack great success in pragmatic competence include the lack of pragmatic knowledge, L1 transfer, and linguistic deficiency, (2) linguistic competence and pragmatic competence in the three aspects of request were positively correlated at a weak level, and English reading and writing skills the teachers taught were found negatively related to the teachers' pragmatic competence, (3) social status and social distance of the interlocutors did not have influence on the utterances made by the participants. It is suggested that Thai English teachers be provided intensive and extensive training on linguistic and pragmatic knowledge.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The present study would not have been completed if I did not receive consistent support and encouragement from my insightful supervisor, Asst. Prof. Dr. Patama Aksornjarung. She was providing fruitful comments on draft after draft. Her kindness and patience have been helpful for making this research project possible.

In addition, I'm also indebted to my thesis co-advisor, Asst. Prof. Dr. Chonlada Laohawiriyanon, for her thoughtful and critical guidance, and invaluable assistance.

Sincere thanks are also due to my examining committees, Dr. Pittayatorn Kaewkong and Asst. Prof. Dr. Waraporn Sripetpun, for their thorough and constructive comments for improving this thesis.

Furthermore, my appreciation is given to Mr. Michael Currie, Ms. Kristra Quesenberry, Mr. Stephan Cannon, Mr. David Allen, and Mr. Douglas Walls for being the raters of the utterances obtained from an oral discourse completion test (ODCT) employed in my study.

I would also like to thank Ajarn Anchana Rakthong, Mr. Warakorn Prommanee, and Ms. Kornwika Sukkrajang for their statistic assistance. I also owe a special thank to all the teachers who were the participants in the present study. Without their cooperation, this research would not have been completed.

Most of all, I would like to express my esteem to all my family members, especially my father whose financial support made my study possible. I would also like to thank my M.A friends in this program who always strengthened me, and walked through all problems with me.

Suratchawadee Pinyo

# CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
<b>ABSTRACT (THAI)</b> .....	iii
<b>ABSTRACT (ENGLISH)</b> .....	iv
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	v
<b>CONTENTS</b> .....	vi
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	ix
<b>CHAPTERS</b>	
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
1.1 Rationale of the Study.....	1
1.2 Purposes of the Study.....	3
1.3 Research Questions.....	4
1.4 Scope and Limitation of the study.....	4
1.5 Significance of the Study.....	4
1.7 Definition of Terms.....	5
<b>2. LITERATURE REVIEW</b> .....	6
2.1 Review of Literature.....	6
2.1.1 Semantics versus Pragmatics.....	6
2.1.2 Pragmatics and Speech Acts.....	7
2.1.3 Politeness.....	10
2.1.4 Pragmatic Competence versus Pragmatic Failure.....	11
2.1.5 Factors Influencing L2 Learners' Pragmatic Acquisition...	13
2.2 Related Studies.....	15
2.2.1 L2 Learners' Pragmatic Failure.....	15
2.2.2 Factors Influencing L2 Learners' Pragmatic Acquisition....	19
2.2.2.1 Linguistic Competence.....	19
2.2.2.2 Length of Residence in a Target Country.....	20
2.2.2.3 Exposure to Authentic Input.....	22
2.2.2.4 Pragmatic Awareness.....	24
2.2.3 Studies on the Influence of Social Factors on Politeness.....	26

## CONTENTS (Continued)

	<b>Page</b>
2.2.4 Related Studies on the Speech Act regarding Requests.....	29
<b>3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....</b>	<b>35</b>
3.1 Subjects.....	35
3.2 Research Instruments.....	35
3.2.1 An Oral Discourse Completion Test (ODCT).....	36
3.2.2 Questionnaire.....	36
3.2.3 English Proficiency Score.....	38
3.2.4 Interview.....	38
3.2.5 The Test of Pearson Correlation Coefficient.....	39
3.3 Pilot Study.....	39
3.4 Data Collection.....	40
3.5 Data Analysis.....	41
<b>4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION.....</b>	<b>44</b>
4.1 The Pragmatic Competence in Making, Accepting, and Declining Requests of Thai English Teachers.....	44
4.2 Factors Influencing the Pragmatic Competence of Thai English Teachers in Making, Accepting, and Declining Requests.....	46
4.2.1 English Language Proficiency.....	46
4.2.2 Educational Backgrounds.....	47
4.2.3 Teaching Experience.....	49
4.2.4 Activities Using English in Daily Life.....	51
4.2.5 Awareness in Language Use.....	53
4.3 The Influence of the Interlocutors' Social Status and Social Distance on the Utterances Made by the Thai English Teachers.....	56
4.4 Discussion.....	59
4.4.1 The Overall Pragmatic Competence in Making, Accepting, and Declining Requests of Thai English Teachers.....	59

## CONTENTS (Continued)

	<b>Page</b>
4.4.2 Strategies Employed by the Thai English Teachers to perform The Three Aspects of Requests.....	65
4.4.3 Factors Influencing the Teachers' Pragmatic Competence in The Three Aspects of Requests.....	70
4.4.3.1 Pragmatic Competence versus Linguistic Competence.....	70
4.4.3.2 Pragmatic Competence versus Authentic Input Exposure.....	70
4.4.3.3 Pragmatic Competence versus Pragmatic Awareness.....	72
4.4.4 The Influence of the Interlocutors' Social Status and Social Distance on the Utterances Made by the Thai English Teachers.....	74
<b>5. SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>76</b>
5.1 Summary of Research Findings.....	76
5.2 Pedagogical Implications.....	79
5.3 Recommendations for Further Studies.....	80
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>APPENDIXES.....</b>	<b>89</b>
A. Pragmatic Completion Test (English Version).....	90
Pragmatic Completion Test (Thai Version).....	93
B. Appropriate Answers for the Oral Discourse Completion Test .....	96
C. Questionnaire (English Version).....	101
Questionnaire (Thai Version).....	107
D. Interview Questions.....	113
E. The Participants' Demographic Information.....	114
<b>VITAE.....</b>	<b>115</b>



## LISTS OF TABLES

<b>Tables</b>	<b>Page</b>
3.1: Changes in Questionnaires.....	37
4.1: English Teachers' Pragmatic Competence in Making, Accepting and Declining Requests .....	44
4.2: Three Aspects of the Pragmatic Competence .....	45
4.3: Pragmatic Competence in the Three Aspects of Request .....	45
4.4: Correlation between English Proficiency and Pragmatic Competence .....	46
4.5: Correlation between Educational Backgrounds and Pragmatic Competence	48
4.6: Correlation between Teaching Experience and Pragmatic Competence.....	50
4.7: Correlation between Teachers' Opportunities to Use English in Daily Life and Pragmatic Competence .....	51
4.8: Correlation between Activities Using English in Daily Life and Pragmatic Competence .....	53
4.9: Frequency of Awareness of Language Use .....	54
4.10: Correlation between Awareness in Language Use and Pragmatic Competence .....	55
4.11: Interview Information.....	56
4.12: Correlation between Social Status and Social Distance, and the Utterances Made by the Thai English Teachers.....	57

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

The present study investigated Thai English teachers' pragmatic competence in making, accepting and declining requests. This chapter presents background information of the study. It consists of six major parts: rationale of the study, purpose of the study, research questions, the scope and significance of the study, and the definitions of terms.

### 1.1. Rationale of the Study

English has played a role as a major medium for global communication. It has gained itself a status as an international language (Jenkins, 2003; McKay, 2002; Smith, 1988). According to Crystal (1997), English is used by people all over the world, categorized as the Inner Circle, where English is used as a mother tongue, in the Outer Circle where English serves as a second language such as India, Singapore and the Philippines, and even more in the Expanding Circle where English is studied as a foreign language such as China, Germany, Japan and Thailand (McKay, 2002). On a small scale, people whose first language is not English use it for various purposes: to access intellectual resources, to further study and to increase career opportunities. On a larger scale, English is considered a prominent language in a variety of fields, including international trade, banking, industry, diplomacy, science and technology, entertainment and education (Crystal, 1997; Smith, 1988). Given such worldwide importance, an individual's English ability needs to be at least at a comprehensible level.

To use English successfully in international communication, where people with different linguistic and cultural backgrounds interact with each other, communicative competence is truly essential (Bachman, 1990; Canale and Swain, 1980; Hymes, 1971).

Communicative competence is defined as the ability to use grammatically correct sentences in appropriate contexts (Hymes, 1971). In other words,

communicative competence subsumes linguistic competence and pragmatic competence. Linguistic competence refers to the ability to recognize language rules in order to form grammatically correct sentences while pragmatic competence is the ability to use language appropriately in contexts.

Thomas (1983) subdivided pragmatic competence into two parts: pragmalinguistic competence, the ability to use grammar rules to form sentences correctly, and socio-pragmatic competence, the ability to communicate properly according to the social rules of a language. Lack of either of the mentioned competence may cause a mistake in cross-cultural communication, known as pragmatic failure (Thomas, 1983).

Pragmatic failure, which is caused mainly by a lack of or inadequate pragmatic competence, was first defined by Thomas (1983) as the inability to use an appropriate language form to express a particular meaning in a particular context and to understand a speaker's intention when that person makes an utterance. Such failure is divided into two segments: pragmalinguistic failure and sociopragmatic failure. The former mainly deals with the linguistic problems that occur when inappropriate language forms are used to perform actions. The latter, on the other hand, is caused by misunderstandings which arise from the different perceptions that affect linguistic choices during cross-cultural exchanges. Pragmatic failure is more serious than linguistic failure (Thomas, 1983). A person might sound rude or disrespectful when he or she commits a pragmatic error, which could lead to breakdowns in communication.

As pragmatic competence plays an important role in cross-cultural communication, and EFL speakers have limited chance to acquire pragmatic competence from the existing context, the question is whether EFL speakers can be helped to overcome this restriction. Scholars (Bardovi-Harlig, 1996; Edwards & Cziser, 2004; Eslami-Rasekh, 2005; Kasper, 1997) have pointed out that EFL classroom may be a potential place for their pragmatic development. The English teacher, thus, probably is the only available resort the learner could rely on to develop and acquire their pragmatic competence. Several research findings in the field of second language acquisition (Bardovi-Harlig, 1996; Edwards & Csizer, 2004; Eslami-Rasekh, 2004; Eslami-Rasekh, 2005; House, 1996; Wannaruk, 2005) confirm that

explicit teaching of target language pragmatics in EFL classroom is necessary, provided that English teachers have good command of pragmatic competence. If teachers who teach English have poor command of pragmatic competence, it might cause students to also have poor pragmatic competence, which in turn can cause pragmatic failure in cross-cultural communication and can lead to communication breakdown (Thomas, 1983).

However, the issue of teachers' pragmatic competence has not attracted the attention it deserves. Instead, the majority of studies have concentrated on investigating the pragmatic failure of EFL learners rather than on the supportive role that teachers can play in the pragmatic acquisition by learners. It is, thus, the purpose of the present study to investigate the pragmatic competence of this group of population. In particular, the present study examines speech act of requests, the most frequently-occurred speech act in daily life (Kasper & Rose, 2002; Mei-Chen, 1996). Additionally, it is a face-threatening speech act speakers can hardly avoid, especially, when social variables of their counterpart are not taken into account (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The present study examines three aspects of requests: making, accepting and declining requests.

## **1.2 Purposes of the Study**

The present study is aimed at the following four objectives.

1. To investigate the pragmatic competence of Thai English teachers in making, accepting and declining requests
2. To determine the factors influencing the pragmatic competence of Thai English teachers in making, accepting and declining requests
3. To explore whether the interlocutor's social status and social distance influence the utterances Thai English teachers made in making, accepting and declining requests

### **1.3 Research Questions**

The study was carried out to answer the three following research questions.

1. To what extent do Thai English teachers have pragmatic competence in making, accepting and declining requests?
2. What factors influence the pragmatic competence of Thai English teachers in making, accepting and declining requests?
3. Do the interlocutors' social status and social distance influence the utterances used by Thai English teachers in making, accepting and declining requests? How?

### **1.4 Scope and Limitations**

1. This study investigated the pragmatic competence of Thai English teachers who are enrolled in the Master's Degree program in Teaching English as an International Language at the Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Hat Yai campus in the 2009 academic year.
2. The main focus of the present study is on three aspects of requests: making, accepting and declining requests. The situations under each aspect were constructed with two social variables: status and distance.

### **1.5 Significance of the Study**

It is expected that the findings from this study will provide the scenario of pragmatic competence of Thai English teachers in three aspects of requests: making, accepting and declining. Besides, it will reveal whether two social variables: social status and social distance have any relationship with the teachers' utterances. It will also provide information about factors contributing to the degree of pragmatic competence in making, accepting and declining requests the teachers possess.

In addition, the findings from this study may help raise English teachers' awareness of the importance of pragmatic knowledge and competence leading to their incorporation of this area into their classroom practice.

## **1.6 Definition of Terms**

The present study was developed around three key terms: pragmatic competence, pragmatic failure, and oral discourse completion test elaborated below.

### **1. Pragmatic competence**

Pragmatic competence in this study refers to the ability to use an appropriate language form to express a particular meaning for a given context and to understand a speaker's intention when he makes an utterance. It will be measured by an oral discourse completion test.

### **2. Pragmatic failure**

Pragmatic failure is the inability to use an appropriate language form to express a particular meaning for a particular context and to understand a speaker's intention when he makes an utterance. It will also be investigated by an oral discourse completion test.

### **3. Oral discourse completion test (ODCT)**

An oral discourse completion test in this study is a test that requires respondents to read a Thai description of a situation, and to say aloud in English what they would say in that situation.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

The present study investigated the pragmatic competence of Thai English teachers in three aspects of requests: making, accepting, and declining requests. It also sought to uncover the factors influencing the teachers' pragmatic competence and to examine the influence of the interlocutors' social status and social distance on the utterances made by the teachers. This chapter consists of a review of related literature and related studies. The literature includes the similarities and differences between semantics and pragmatics, pragmatics and speech act, politeness, pragmatic competence and pragmatic failure, and factors influencing L2 learners' pragmatic competence. The section on related studies covers studies related to L2 learners' pragmatic failure, the factors influencing L2 learners' pragmatic acquisition, the effect of social status and social distance on the choices of linguistic expressions, and speech act regarding requests.

#### **2.1 Review of Literature**

##### **2.1.1 Semantics versus Pragmatics**

Semantics and pragmatics, sub-divisions of linguistics, involve the study of meanings in a particular language. The two terms, however, focus on different aspects of meaning. Semantics is the study of utterance meaning regardless of place and time of occurrence (Chierchia & McConnell-Ginet, 1990). It is aimed at understanding the meanings of a word, phrase or sentence (Bowen, 2001). Pragmatics, on the other hand, refers to the study of how language is used to convey meanings in communication by speakers or writers (Richards, J. Platt, & H. Platt, 1992). In particular, it deals with the appropriateness of language use in different social contexts, such as requests, apologies, complaints, compliments, etc. The example in Cohen (1996), "It's hot in here," can have two different meanings.

Semantically, the sentence above is an informative expression a speaker addresses about the weather at that particular moment without any hidden meaning or implication. This meaning is similar to locutionary meaning termed by Cohen (1996). Pragmatic interpretation or illocutionary meaning (Cohen, 1996), however, requires a hearer to consider other environmental factors and social rules. This same utterance is probably intended as a request asking a hearer to do a corresponding action; the speaker may want a hearer to open a window because the weather is hot. It may also act as a complaint.

Thus, it is suggested that in addition to linguistic competence (the ability to use linguistic knowledge of a target language to convey the meaning, and to understand the meaning), L2 learners need to be able to distinguish the meaning of an expression made in a context. This ability will help create successful cross-cultural communication. In other words, L2 learners need to be equipped with pragmatic competence so that they are able to achieve the communication goal.

### **2.1.2 Pragmatics and Speech Acts**

Different definitions of pragmatics have been made to shed light on its nature. Levinson (1983) defines the field as the study of language usage. In a more detailed definition, it is the study of communicative actions in relation to its socio-cultural contexts (Kasper, 1997). The field was classified into two components: pragma-linguistics and socio-pragmatics. The former relates to appropriateness of language patterns, and the latter concerns appropriateness of meaning in a social context (Thomas, 1983).

One of the key areas of pragmatics is speech acts which refer to the acts a speaker performs when making utterances (Levinson, 1983). The concept of speech act theory first appeared in the work of Austin (1962). According to Austin, utterances are made to perform three kinds of acts: locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary. The locutionary act is an act when something is said. The illocutionary act is an act of doing something by using the locutionary act performed



by the speaker, and the perlocutionary act is a subsequent effect on the hearer's actions that the speaker makes by saying something. Among these, the illocutionary act is regarded as the central component of language function because it is the action actually performed by the speaker to convey his/her purpose (Austin, 1962). Considering its importance, Searle (1969) argued that the illocutionary act is the basic linguistic communication unit.

Regarding its types, Searle divided the illocutionary act into five major classes: (1) Representatives, which commit the speaker to assert something to be true by using verbs as 'suggest', 'report', 'believe', and 'conclude', (2) Directives, which try to make the hearer perform an action by employing verbs as 'order', 'request', 'invite', and 'beg', (3) Commissive, which commit the speaker to doing something in the future with different verbs as 'promise', 'plan', 'vow', and 'oppose', (4) Expressives, which express how the speaker feels about the situation. The verbs used are such as, 'thank', 'apologize', 'welcome', 'deplore', and (5) Declarations, which change the state of the world in an immediate way by making an utterance like "I name this baby Sofia."

There are many different types of speech act, including requests, offerings, complaints, commands, refusals, greetings, apologies. A brief review of the strategies employed to perform these speech acts are given below.

### **Requests**

The very well-known strategies in making request are from the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) of Blum-Kulka & Olshtain (1984). Based on the data obtained from the project, three levels of strategies are categorized:

1. Direct request strategies, such as "Give me some water."
2. Conventionally indirect request strategies, such as "Could you give me some water?" or "How about going to see a movie?"
3. Non-conventionally indirect request strategies, such as "I'm thirsty."

Each strategy type comprises two parts: Head Acts, which are the main expressions for making requests, and/ or Supportive Moves, which refer to

expressions providing reasons of the request, other supporting information, politeness markers, or alerters. The below sentence is given to clarify each mentioned part.

**Example:**

Excuse me. Can I borrow your pen? Mine is broken.

Supportive Move + Head Act + Supportive Move

A politeness marker, “Excuse me” in the example acts as Supportive Move. “Mine is broken.” is another Supportive Move providing the reason of a request. “Can I borrow your pen?” is Head Act of this sentence.

**Refusals of Requests**

Since only saying “No” in a refusal situation may risk face threats of both a speaker and a hearer, other strategies are required to mitigate this risk. According to Wannaruk’s (2005) analysis of previous research on refusals (Beebe et. Al. (1990), He (1998), and Iwata (1999)), the refusal strategies can be classified into two main groups. The first one is direct strategies by saying “No” or employing negative willingness/ ability (e.g. “I can’t,” “I won’t”). The other is indirect strategies which include (1) Regret (e.g. “I’m sorry”), (2) Positive opinion (e.g. “I wish I could help you.”), (3) Excuse, reason and explanation, (4) Suggesting other alternatives in order to maintain a positive relationship with the interlocutor, (5) Future acceptance (e.g. I’ll do it next time.).

**Acceptance**

According to Allwood, Nivre, and Ahlsen (1993), “Yes” and “Okay” are common words being employed in the speech act of acceptance or agreement. Other strategies found are using expressions or phrases, such as “Of course”, “Certainly”, “Sure” (Joonthawithed, 2002).

The information above suggests that direct strategies are obvious and understandable by the language patterns. In contrast, to understand conventionally indirect strategies, a hearer may need to have an ability to infer to the speaker’s intention. A hearer encounters more difficulties in interpreting a speaker’s intention when s/he involves in a situation where non-conventionally indirect request strategies were made.

In regards to the indirectness of speech act, Grice's (1975 cited in Cruse, 2000) conversational maxim provides a means to comprehend what is implicated in a conversation by using indirect speech act. This conversational maxim consists of four major maxims: relation (be relevant), quantity (be as informative as required), quality (be truthful), and manner (be clear). These four maxims can help explain the implicature in a conversation (Cruse, 2000). They can also be applied to the interpretation of indirect strategies of other types of speech acts.

### **2.1.3 Politeness**

In language study, politeness is the expressions of the speaker's intention to mitigate face threats carried by certain face threatening acts. It shows how language expresses the relationship between a speaker and a hearer, and how people establish, maintain, and save face during their conversation (Richards, J. Platt, & H. Platt, 1992). According to Cruse (2000), politeness is the matter of what is said, and not the matter of what is believed or thought.

Since politeness is considered important in social interaction, it has become one of the most productive areas of research in pragmatics. The well-known account on politeness is "Politeness Theory" proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). According to the scholars, speakers do not just convey information through their language; they use their language to do things. Politeness theory rests on three basic ideas: face, face threatening acts (FTAs), and politeness strategies. Face is defined as "the public self-image that every member wants to claim for him/ herself." The face is divided into two types: Positive and negative face. The former refers to one's self-esteem while the latter refers to one's freedom to act. When engaged in social interaction, social actors try to save their face, and they do not want to make the other loose face.

The second area is face-threatening acts which are acts that inherently damage the face of the addressee or the speaker by acting in opposition to the wants and desires of the other (Brown and Levinson, 1987). In performing FTAs, actors have to

consider the potential of face risks. They have to consider social contextual factors between them and a hearer. These social factors are social status, social distance, and the imposition of act. A speaker has to take into account these three social variables to determine the level of politeness which a speaker will use to a hearer.

The last area of politeness theory is politeness strategies. The strategies are divided into two parts: positive strategies and negative strategies. The first refer to a hearer's positive face wants, such as expressions of solidarity, informality, and familiarity. The other are addressed to the hearer's negative face wants. They can be described as expressions of restraint, formality and distancing. To reduce the risk of face-threatening acts, either positive or negative strategies are used, depending on the social relationship between a speaker and a hearer.

Given what discussed earlier, it can be concluded that the speech act regarding requests is likely to involve face-threatening. When making a request, a speaker risks to loose face if a hearer responds in opposition to what s/he wants. When refusing a request, a speaker also risks making a hearer loose his/her face. Accepting a request can also be face-threatening if a speaker is unable to use appropriate language forms. In performing these three areas of request behavior, politeness, thus, gets involved since a speaker has to determine the degree of politeness before producing an utterance to different hearers. Failing to use appropriate language forms to perform these different aspects of face-threatening acts can lead to breakdowns in international communication.

#### **2.1.4 Pragmatic Competence versus Pragmatic Failure**

Pragmatic competence is a component of communicative competence (Bachman, 1990; Canale and Swain, 1980; Edwards and Cziser 2004; Hymes, 1971). Pragmatic competence can be defined as the ability to use language forms appropriately in a particular context (Thomas, 1983; Kasper, 1997; McKay, 2002; Xiao and Guangyi, 2005).

Pragmatic competence is classified into two segments: pragma-linguistic competence and socio-pragmatic competence. The former is the ability of using grammar rules to make sentences correctly. The latter, on the other hand, refers to the ability to communicate properly, according to the social rules of a language. Lack of accurate interpretation or pragmatic competence may lead to cross-cultural communication mistakes.

Such mistakes or pragmatic failure was first defined by Thomas (1983) as the inability to use an appropriate language form to express the particular meaning for a particular context and to understand a speaker's intention when s/he makes an utterance. Such failure is divided into two aspects: pragma-linguistic failure and socio-pragmatic failure. The first mainly concerns the linguistic problems that occur when inappropriate language forms are used to perform actions. Such failure occurs when what L2 learners say does not correspond with what is understood by native speakers of the target language, which could be resulted from the speaker's lack of pragmatic knowledge. It can also occur when L2 learners inappropriately transfer speech act strategies from their L1 to L2.

Socio-pragmatic failure, on the other hand, is caused by misunderstandings which arise from the different perceptions that affect linguistic choices during cross-cultural exchanges. Cultural differences between the target language and L1 language can also cause this type of mistake.

Considering degree of seriousness, pragmatic failure is more serious than linguistic failure (Thomas, 1983). A person might sound rude or disrespectful when he commits a pragmatic error which can lead to communication breakdown, for example. The possible cause of such failure, thus, attracts researchers of the field.

Thomas (1983) argues that cultural differences and negative transfer from learners' L1 to L2 could be one of the causes of pragmatic failure. Kasper (1997) addresses a different view arguing that inadequate pragmatic knowledge can also cause pragmatic failure. Yet another researcher, Mei-Xiao (2008) proposes three potential sources of pragmatic failure: differences between a speaker's culture and the target culture, pragmatic transfer (the influence from a speaker's native language and

culture on his or her pragmatic knowledge and performance (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993), and a lack of pragmatic knowledge.

### **2.1.5 Factors Influencing L2 Learners' Pragmatic Acquisition**

It has been accepted that in EFL contexts learners have a limited chance to use the language. Thus, their acquisition of pragmatic competence seems difficult. However, researchers (Rose, 1994; Edwards & Csizer, 2004; Eslami-Rasehk, 2004; McLean, 2004; Dong, 2006; Mei-Xiao, 2008) posit that factors, such as L2 learners' linguistic competence of a target language, a residence in a target country, exposure to authentic input, and pragmatic awareness can benefit EFL learners' pragmatic development.

Having a good command of linguistic ability of a target language will benefit pragmatic acquisition. Previous studies have proven that a lack of a target language linguistic knowledge is one of the factors causing L2 learners to fail in achieving great success in pragmatic competence (Nguyen, 2008). The results from these studies clearly show that linguistic competence is a very first tool for L2 learners to develop their pragmatic competence. However, the question is whether learners with high language proficiency will possess a high level of pragmatic competence. This issue is of scholars' interest. Some studies investigating this area will be discussed in the next section.

The second factor which is believed to be advantageous to L2 learners' pragmatic development is residence in a target country. Living in the country where learners have to use a target language as a means for their daily communication may give them a chance to develop their linguistic knowledge and pragmatic competence of a target language (Kasper & Rose, 2002). In addition, contact with native speakers may indirectly help pragmatic acquisition of learners (Porter, 1986 cited in Kasper & Rose, 2002). In the analysis of previous research, Jung (2002) also posits that living in the host community is positively related to a level of attainment in various aspects of pragmatic ability.

Another factor, authentic input may offer many advantages: presenting the use of language in real life, implying the existence of social distances, cultural differences and social values in real communication. To date, a number of studies have been conducted to examine whether the pragmatic competence of EFL learners can be developed through certain types of activities. One popular instrument frequently used to help promote such competence of the learners is authentic materials. Rose (1997) states, "In foreign language contexts, exposure to film is generally the closest that language learners will ever get to witnessing or participating in native speaker interaction." In the same way, Grant & Starks (2001) claim that television conversations provide a wide variety of language function in an English conversation, imitate natural speech and present cultural and linguistic behavior of both the language and the participants. Guerray & Flor (2003) further posit that the use of films in the classroom provides learners with a great potential value to their pragmatic development, since it presents real language use in various contexts.

Lastly, pragmatic awareness or awareness in how to use language appropriately according to contexts (Rose, 1994; Eslami-Rasekh, 2005) is also a factor contributing to L2 learners' pragmatic development. It is, hence, suggested that raising learners' pragmatic awareness may be effective to develop this type of competence of L2 learners. If learners possess a satisfactory level of pragmatic awareness, they are likely to have a good command of pragmatic ability. Rose (1994) suggests that pragmatic awareness raising has the distinct advantage of providing learners with primary information of the roles of pragmatics. Similarly, in her attempt to bring pragmatics and pedagogy together, Bardovi-Harlig (1996) states that raising awareness is effective for L2 learners' pragmatic development.

Consequently, a considerable number of pragmatic studies have been carried out to explore the potential of the four factors discussed above. Some of these studies are reviewed in the following section.

## **2.2 Review of Related Studies**

This section provides a brief review of studies concerning pragmatics. It covers four areas: L2 learners' pragmatic failure, factors influencing the pragmatic acquisition of L2 learners, studies investigating influence of the interlocutor's social contextual variables on L2 Learners' utterances, and studies on speech act regarding requests.

### **2.2.1 L2 learners' Pragmatic Failure**

Previous research has proven that L2 learners did encounter difficulties in their cross-cultural communication. Three kinds of factors are identified as main causes of their lack great success. They are lack of pragmatic knowledge, L1 transfer and cultural differences. A great deal of research was, as a consequence, carried out to examine the potential of the three sources mentioned above, Gajaseni (1994), Urano (2000), Cedar (2005), Prachanant (2006), Mei-Xiao (2008), and Nguyen (2008), for instance.

Gajaseni (1994) investigated the differences in compliment responses between Thai speakers and English native speakers. In this contrastive study, she also included gender and social status as the factors controlling the participants' linguistic choices. Data were collected by means of an oral discourse completion task from 40 American undergraduate (20 males and 20 females). The data were tape-recorded and were compared to English data elicited from Thai undergraduate students of equal number. Results showed that culture in responding to compliments of Americans and Thais was different. Americans usually accepted. On the contrary, Thais did not directly accept it. The Thais used other strategies, such as shift credit in which credit for the thing complimented was shifted from the recipient to some third parties. Gajaseni (1994) suggested that Thai speakers should be made aware of these differences to avoid any miscommunication.



In another similar contrastive study, Urano (2000) investigated negative pragmatic transfer in compliment responses by Japanese EFL learners of English. The data were collected through individual interviews. Twenty Japanese learners of English enrolled in the undergraduate or graduate programs at the University of Hawaii at Manoa participated in the study. The data were compared to those obtained from 20 Americans studying in the same university. Results showed negative L1 transfer in the Japanese EFL learners' compliment responses. Urano (2000), thus, suggested that this negative transfer may lead to communication misunderstandings.

Another study focusing on the speech act of compliment was conducted by Cedar (2005). Using individual interview, Cedar investigated Thai and American responses to English compliments. Twelve Thai students in the English as a second language program at Boston University took part in the study. English baseline information was given by 12 American students at the same university. Results showed that Thai learners responded differently from the Americans. In particular, Thai learners used the language forms that were not realized by the Americans. Therefore, Cedar suggested that English should be taught together with its culture.

In another comparative study, Prachanant (2006) investigated the occurrences of pragmatic strategies and pragmatic transfer in complaint responses given by Thai EFL learners in the Hotel business and by native English-speaking hotel employees. The respondents were asked to write their responses to ten provoking-complaint situations. The findings revealed that the strategies utilized by the two groups had both similarities and differences. They made an apology as a complaint response. The significant difference found between the two groups was the Thais used less frequency of acknowledgement of responsibility compared to Americans. In particular, pragmatic transfer occurred in the responses given by high proficiency Thai learners because their sufficient linguistic knowledge led them to transfer their native language to the target language.

Another similar study on EFL learners by Mei-Xiao (2008) investigated the sources of pragmatic failure made by Chinese EFL learners. Five Chinese students (one male and four females) took part in the exploratory study using a written

discourse completion task (WDCT). Their age ranged from 24 to 32 years old. They were considered advanced EFL learners having achieved IELTS of 6.0 or TOEFL of 600. They provided responses for five different situations (two for compliments, one for compliment response and the other two for making requests). The data were compared to the responses given by five native speakers of English (one male and four females). A native speaker rater indicated that the Chinese EFL learners lacked competence in using English in the given social contexts.

With the same purpose, Nguyen (2008) carried out a study on EFL learners' pragmatic strategies. The purpose of the study was to investigate the differences between the strategies in criticizing used by Vietnamese EFL learners and those by English native speakers, and to discover the factors affecting their pragmatic choices. Thirty-six Vietnamese adult learners participated in the study. Data were collected by means of a peer-feedback task, a written questionnaire, and an interview. First language baseline data were obtained from 12 Vietnamese native speakers. Twelve native speakers of Australian English also provided second language baseline data. Results showed that the strategies in criticizing utilized by Vietnamese participants were significantly different from those employed by Australians in three areas: preference for realization strategies, semantic formulae, and the choice and frequency of mitigating devices. Nguyen pointed out that three main factors causing the Vietnamese to be different from the Australians were their L2 linguistic insufficiency, a lack of pragmatic knowledge, and L1 transfer.

With respect to the research discussed earlier, it is evident that EFL learners encounter difficulties in their cross-cultural interaction due to insufficient pragmatic competence. Thus, to help them avoid making such mistake, scholars (Olshtain & Cohen, 1990; Bardovi-Harlig, 1996; Edwards & Csizer, 2004; Eslami-Rasekh, 2004; Suh 2009) carried out studies in order to find ways to help EFL learners.

Olshtain and Cohen (1990), for instance, conducted a three-week training study for the purpose. A pre-post teaching questionnaire aimed at assessing the subjects' use of apologies and teaching materials were employed in the study. Eighteen adult Hebrew learners of English participated in the training aiming at

investigating the efficacy of teaching pragmatics on the learners' improvement of apology strategies. In the training, the participants received pragmatic guidance on specific features of apology. It was reported from the training that the learners' apology behavior, choices of strategy, and awareness of situational factors became more native-like after the workshop.

Besides training, instruction is considered another way to help EFL learners acquire pragmatic knowledge. Bardovi-Harlig (1996) is one of prominent scholars in this area. In her review of earlier studies examining how L2 learners acquired pragmatic competence, she found that instruction on pragmatics is useful for L2 learners. For instance, Holmes and Brown (1987) offered many useful methods (e.g. using natural compliment data) for learning about compliments after their successful experiment. In another study by Frescura (1991), it was found that a listening comprehension lesson could help improve the use of strategies for disagreement speech act. In a similar experiment by Morrow (1995), instruction in complaints and refusals helped learners achieved long term goals. From this success reported, Bardovi-Harlig suggested that pragmatic instruction should be brought into language classrooms.

Similar to Bardovi-Harlig, Kasper (1997) maintains that without some forms of instruction, many aspects of pragmatic competence do not develop sufficiently. She points out that some pragmatic aspects could be acquired without instruction if learners' L1 form-function is similar to that of L2. Unfortunately, learners do not know what they possess, so they do not make use of it. Therefore, it is necessary to make learners aware of what they already know in L1 and encourage them to use it in L2.

Referring to the review above, it can be inferred that a teacher can be a key factor to help EFL learners acquire pragmatic competence. However, a teacher who gives pragmatic instruction to EFL learners must be equipped with a good command of pragmatic knowledge. Dong (2006) surveyed the pragmatic competence of English teachers. He distributed a multiple-choice discourse completion questionnaire to 120 Chinese English teachers in remote areas of China. The teachers were required to give

an answer to a DCT test. The test was composed of 48 situations focusing on 21 speech acts. Results showed that these teachers' pragmatic competence was in a rather low level. Their lack of pragmatic knowledge was identified as a main cause. It was recommended that more research be conducted to investigate the pragmatic competence of EFL teachers.

## **2.2.2 Factors Influencing L2 Learners' Pragmatic Acquisition**

The acquisition of pragmatic competence by L2 learners is significantly influenced by linguistic competence, length of residence in a target country, exposure to authentic input, and pragmatic awareness (Hoffman-Hicks, 1992; Bardovi-Harlig, 1999; Kasper & Rose, 2002; Eslami-Rasekh, 2005). This section will provide brief review of existing literature concerning these factors.

### **2.2.2.1 Linguistic Competence**

Linguistic competence of a target language has received great attention as a factor affecting pragmatic competence. It has been extensively studied to prove whether learners with high language proficiency will possess a relatively high level of pragmatic competence. Examples of these studies include Hoffman-Hicks (1992), Bardovi-Harlig (1999) and Li (2007).

Hoffman-Hicks (1992), for example, examined the relationship between linguistic and pragmatic competence. Three tests (a standardized multiple-choice test of French, a role-play questionnaire and a discourse completion test) were employed in the study. Fourteen students of French at Indiana University and nine native speakers of French participated. The results from the study showed that linguistic competence was essential for pragmatic development. It was a means that allowed the learners to express their pragmatic knowledge. Hoffman-Hicks also posited that linguistic competence did not guarantee pragmatic competence. In other words, the level of linguistic competence needed for adequate communication in given language use situations does not necessarily assure learners of socio-cultural appropriateness in the contexts.

In reviewing previous research, Bardovi-Harlig (1999) found that in comparison to low language proficiency learners, high proficient learners seemed to possess higher level of pragmatic competence (e.g. Scarcella (1979), Blum-Kulka & Olshtain (1986), T.Takahashi & Beebe (1987), Trosborg (1987)). However, these studies showed that even advanced learners had not mastered some basic pragmatics. In some pragmatic aspects, they still performed differently from native speakers.

Further, Li (2007) carried out a study to investigate the relationship between the learners' linguistic proficiency and pragmatic ability. Forty-two non-English major students at Bei Hang University were the participants. A Chinese English Test of the year 2004 was used to test the participants' linguistic competence while the test made by the reasearcher (multiple-choice discourse completion test and true or false test) was used to examine their pragmatic competence. The scores from the two tests were then correlated. The findings showed a positive relationship between the two kinds of competence, but at a very weak level. Therefore, Li (2007) concluded that linguistic competence was necessary but not sufficient for pragmatic development.

In conclusion, previous studies have proven that linguistic competence is a necessary tool for pragmatic acquisition. However, it does not guarantee the high level of pragmatic ability.

#### **2.2.2.2 Length of Residence in a Target Country**

In addition to linguistic competence, length of residence in a target country is admitted beneficial to L2 learners' pragmatic development. Bardovi-Harlig (1999) posits that the length of residence in a target country has a great influence on the acquisition of pragmatic competence. Blum-Kulka & Olshtain (1985 cited in Bardovi-Harlig, 1999) find out from their study that an acceptance of direct request strategies by non-native speakers of Hebrew increases because their length of stay increases.

Schmidt's (1983 cited in Bardovi-Harlig, 1999) well-known longitudinal study on Wes' pragmatic acquisition is one study confirming the advantages of staying in an English-speaking country. Wes is an adult Japanese EFL learner in Hawaii. When Wes arrived in the United States, his English ability was minimal. At first, Wes used either formulaic requests such as "Shall we go?" or incorrect forms as "Sitting?"

(intended to mean, Shall we sit down?). Over three years of staying in Hawaii, his linguistic forms for making a request significantly improved (Shall we maybe go out coffee now, or you want later?). Furthermore, Schmidt interestingly noted that Wes' grammatical accuracy did not improve much though his pragmatic development did. This finding from Wes can contribute to the conclusion that linguistic competence is necessary for pragmatic acquisition.

Another example of the benefit of length of stay in a target country to pragmatic acquisition can be seen in the study of Bouton (1992). He conducted a study to determine how living in USA and communicating daily in English provided students with skills in interpreting implicature. Subjects were 30 non-native students of English who had stayed in USA for about 4.5 years. They all were tested by a multiple-choice test, specifically designed to measure the ability in implicature interpretation. The subjects used to take this test when they first enrolled in the university in 1986. The scores from 1986 test and the one done in the study were compared. Results showed that the subjects' implicature interpretation had significantly improved.

In a similar study, Sasaki and Beamer (2002) compared the transfer of learners' perceptions of refusal speech act from their first language to their length of residence in the target language environment. Data were collected from three different groups, with a total of 64 participants: 16 Japanese native speakers living in Japan, 32 Japanese learners of English living in USA, and 16 American English native speakers. The data obtained from Japanese EFL learners were then compared to those from Japanese living in Japan and from Americans to investigate the L1 effect. This study provided evidence for the pragmatic transfer of refusal strategies with respect to length of residence in a target language environment, which indicates that length of residence does mitigate negative transfer of refusal strategies among Japanese learners of English.

Inspired by previous studies, Iwasaki (2008) carried out an experiment to examine how pragmatics of request-making develops in English-speaking L2 learners of Japanese over an 8-week study-abroad program. Twelve English-speaking learners

(4 males and 8 females) were the participants of the study. A DCT questionnaire comprising 10 requests was given at the beginning and the end of the program. The same DCT questionnaire was also given to 12 Japanese learners of equal sexes in order to get baseline answers. Answers gained from 12 English native learners were compared to those from the Japanese. The results revealed that Japanese EFL learners' responses became more target-like despite spending a short period in a target country.

From the above mentioned studies, it may be assumed that living in a target country for an appropriate period of time may be advantageous for L2 learners' pragmatic development.

### **2.2.2.3 Exposure to Authentic Input**

A number of studies employed authentic materials to help develop EFL learners' pragmatic competence. For instance, in the study by Edwards and Csizer (2004), the excerpts of real-life conversations about opening and closing a conversation were presented to the subjects in order to raise their awareness on cultural differences between their first language and the target one. The findings from this empirical study confirm the advantages of authentic materials to pragmatic development.

Similarly, Alcon (2005) conducted an experiment to examine the efficacy of two different types of instruction: explicit and implicit. One hundred and thirty-two students were divided into three groups: explicit, implicit and control group with 44 students in each group. Though the purpose of his study was not to check the advantages of authentic materials, he made use of the excerpts from the TV series, *Stargate* to get learners in explicit and implicit groups to learn that social distance exists in using a language. The findings showed that both groups receiving the instruction markedly performed better than a control group though the group receiving explicit instruction was better than the implicit one.

In an empirical study by Grossi (2009), naturally-occurring data of compliments and compliment responses by native speakers of different ages and types of relationships were used as instruments to help improve the pragmatic competence

of adult ESL learners. At that time, the participants were attending ESL classes at a Technical and Further Education institution. After two sessions of classroom activities prepared based on the collected data, the learners reported that they learned the differences and the similarities between English and their mother tongue. This suggested that the use of real examples was very helpful in raising their pragmatic awareness.

In the same manner, Suh (2009) carried out a study to investigate metapragmatic instruction on teaching how to mitigate requests. Adult advanced-intermediate level learners took part in the study. They were Somali and Mexican. Pragmatic-oriented activities were employed to raise the participants' awareness in making requests. Authentic request expressions from the movie, *Sherk II* and *A Few Good Men* were used in the awareness-raising activities. Before a treatment, the participants' request knowledge was measured through a written discourse completion task consisting of nine situations in which the participants had to make a request of varying imposition and social power of a hearer. They later received nine-week treatment in a classroom. After that, the participants took the post-test. Results showed significant improvement in their request making.

Above studies confirm the advantages of authentic materials on EFL learners' pragmatic development. Nevertheless, the effectiveness may vary depending on many factors. Of those, the quality of input learners received is considered vital. In this case, activities used in EFL classrooms must be well-planned to ensure that they will benefit learners' pragmatic development. Kasper (1997) suggests that activities should be made to have learners discover the distinction between their first language and a target one so that learners are aware of using appropriate language in their cross-cultural communication.

It can be seen from the studies discussed above that authentic input is genuinely beneficial to the development of L2 learners' pragmatic competence. However, one interesting issue regarding authentic input which cannot be overlooked is whether the input is appropriate and sufficient for L2 learners' pragmatic development.



Bardovi-Harlig (1996) investigated speech act realizations presented in textbooks used in various educational institutions and found that the input did not reflect the actual utterance of native speakers. Those textbooks, thus, may lead learners to misinterpret the culture of the target language, and its rules for speaking and politeness norms.

Jung (2002) is another scholar who insists on the importance of input both in terms of quantity and quality. She found from her review of previous studies (e.g. Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (1996), Tarone and Kuehn (2000) that input to which L2 learners exposed was insufficient and inappropriate to help develop their pragmatic ability. In particular, she suggested that learners, sometimes, were exposed to relevant input, but their lack of training on pragmatic aspects prevents them from noticing the knowledge.

Another researcher, Heidi (2004) analyzed eight English textbooks used in ESL and EFL contexts. The purpose was to compare pragmatic information given in those textbooks in terms of appropriateness and sufficiency. Results based on the analysis showed that there was a shortage of pragmatic information related to ways of speaking in textbooks used in both settings. However, it was found that a larger percentage of pages of EFL texts comprised pragmatic information while the quality of pragmatic information (a number of speech acts and pragmatic cues) was better in ESL texts. Although pragmatic information was included, it was frequently limited in the range of options for expression presented to students. Heidi concluded that the textbooks served as poor models for pragmatically appropriate speech act realization.

Given what mentioned earlier, it should be noted that to successfully develop learners' pragmatic competence, in addition to providing them with sufficient pragmatic information, the appropriateness of information is another area which cannot be ignored.

#### **2.2.2.4 Pragmatic Awareness**

As it is widely accepted that EFL learners lacked opportunities to expose to a target English, and that pragmatic competence is important for successful

international communication, scholars posit that one of the potential approaches to develop learners' pragmatic competence is to raise their pragmatic awareness (Rose, 1994; Bardovi-Harlig, 1996).

Rose (1994) suggests that pragmatic awareness raising has the distinct advantage of providing learners with primary information of the roles of pragmatics. Likewise, in her attempt to bring pragmatics and pedagogy together, Bardovi-Harlig (1996) states that raising pragmatic awareness is important to help develop learners' pragmatic competence. A considerable number of researchers employed this approach in their studies to develop L2 learners' pragmatic competence. Results show that it is an effective way (Kondo, 2002; Eslami-Rasekh, 2004; Safont Jorda, 2004).

Kondo (2002), for instance, employed the pragmatic awareness raising approach to explore the kinds of pragmatic aspects learners became aware of through explicit pragmatic instruction. Thirty-six Japanese EFL learners at a junior college in Japan took part in the experiment. They received 12-week instruction aiming to raise pragmatic awareness. After each week, all participants worked in group and discussed about what they learned to find similarities and differences between English and Japanese. Their discussion was audio-taped for further transcription. The findings revealed that the participants became aware of varieties of pragmatic aspects of English.

In a similar study, Eslami-Rasekh (2004) investigated the effect of explicit metapragmatic instruction on speech act comprehension of advanced EFL students. Sixty-six Iranian EFL undergraduate students were asked to participate in the study. They took the pretest which was a multiple-choice discourse completion test consisting of 26 situations about apologies, requests and complaints in order to control their pragmatic knowledge. After that they were randomly divided into two groups, 34 students in the experimental group and 32 in the control group. The explicit instruction employed with the experimental group comprised teacher-fronted discussion, cooperative grouping, role-plays and other pragmatically-oriented activities. While the experimental group received instruction aimed to raise their pragmatic awareness, the control received normal instruction. After the 12-week

instruction, all of the students took the same test again in order to check the effect of the explicit instruction. Results revealed that students' speech act comprehension improved significantly and that pragmatic competence could be developed through pragmatic awareness raising activities.

Likewise, Safont Jorda (2004) employed an instructional process focusing on raising pragmatic awareness to investigate the effectiveness of explicit pragmatic instruction in an EFL setting. In particular, it aimed at fostering the production of request formulations to people of different social status and distance. One hundred and sixty female students taking an English for Academic Purpose course from Jaume I university at Castello participated in the study. A pre-post test approach was adopted in the data collection procedure. Results showed that the students' pragmatic awareness was significantly improved after receiving the explicit instruction for a semester.

To conclude, the studies mentioned above have shown that pragmatic awareness raising is an effective method to improve EFL learners' pragmatic competence. It implies that this approach can be adopted in EFL settings to help develop learners' pragmatic ability.

### **2.2.3 Studies on the Influence of Social Contextual Factors on the Degree of Politeness**

Three social contextual factors: social status, social distance, and the imposition of act are believed to have major effects on the choices of language patterns in a context (Brown and Levinson, 1987). Brown and Levinson argue that for a person to produce linguistic expressions in social interaction, s/he has to take into account these three social variables between an interlocutor and her/him. A speaker risks losing his/her face and risks making the other lose face if s/he fails to consider the three social variables. Studies on the extent to which these two social variables influence the language patterns employed by native and non-native speakers have

been carried out (Wolfson, 1989; Mei-Chen, 1996; Wei, 1996; Luksaneeyanawin, 2005).

Wolfson (1989) investigated how social status affected the compliments responses made by American English. In an analysis, she found that social status of an interlocutor played an important role in linguistic expressions. It was found that when being complimented by a person of equal status, American English tended to avoid self-praise. On the other hand, 'thank you' is the safest and most appropriate response to people in higher status in the same situation.

Another study carried out by Wei (1996) to analyze the Chinese request strategies in terms of politeness theory proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). A questionnaire was distributed to Chinese EFL learners in Gansu province for data collection. The analysis of the data showed that the choice of polite linguistic usage in requests depended greatly on the social power and the social distance between the speaker and the hearer. It was also found that besides these two social factors which may influence the request behavior, the culture, the social system, public relations under the socialism also affected the linguistic choices of request.

In a similar study, Luksaneeyanawin (2005) investigated the role of social status in Thai EFL learners. Fifty university students participated in the study. It was found that social status had a great effect on the request strategies utilized by the Thai students. Indirectness was often employed when they made a request to people in higher status. The degree of indirectness, on the contrary, decreased when making requests to people of equal or lower status.

However, a contrastive study by Mei-Chen (1996) reported different results. Mei-Chen carried out a study to investigate similarities and differences in requesting strategies between Taiwanese Mandarin and American English. The study also aimed to examine the claim of universality in Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory in that a speaker's utterance production is influenced by the three social variables. One hundred and sixty American and an equal amount of Taiwanese took part in the study. They were required to give their responses to a written discourse completion task (WDCT) consisting of 12 situations. Each situation incorporated

social status, social distance, and imposition of act. Results showed that these variables did not strongly affect the utterances used by both Taiwanese and American participants. Mei-Chen suggested that other variables, such as social rules in each culture and communication styles could be reasons the deviation of request making.

Aside from the findings from her own study, Mei-Chen (1996) also found the same results from previous research investigating the role of social status, social distance, and the imposition of act (e.g. Wierzbicka (1985), Ide (1989), Matsumoto (1989), Gu (1990), and Mao (1994)). These studies suggest that the theory of politeness universality made by Brown and Levinson has to be reconsidered. These three types of social variables only played a minor role in the speakers' decision on linguistic expressions. In some studies (e.g. Gu (1990), Matsumoto (1989)), it was found that the rules of politeness could not be applied because of cultural differences.

Moreover, in reviewing related literature (e.g. Sohn (1986), Bell (1988), Blum-Kulka & House (1989), Miller (1994), Mills (2003), Watt (2003), and Candlin (2005)), Kwai (2008) posits that the degree of politeness influenced by social status and social distance claimed by Brown and Levinson (1987) is not entirely valid. She also found that the degree of the importance of these two social factors varies from culture to culture. The definitions of social status and social distance may be differently interpreted by different speakers.

Another study of which results lend support to Mei-Chen was carried out by Yeung (1997). Yeung investigated the role of three factors of imposition, social distance, and social status proposed in Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness in requests in both English and Chinese business correspondence in Hong Kong. Results show that only the factor of imposition had a statistically significant impact on linguistic choice in the English requests used by Chinese speakers. Social status and social distance did not play a significant role as expected. Yeung suggested that this is due to L1 influence in that Chinese language was not governed by the relative status of the interlocutors.

Another researcher whose findings are in line with those of Mei-Chen and Yeung is Jung (2002). In a review of previous studies investigating the effect of three

social factors: social status, social distance, and the imposition of act (e.g. Ervin-Tripp, 1976; House and Kasper, 1981; Blum-Kulka, 1982, 1987; Blum-Kulka, Danet & Gerson, 1985; Wierzbicka, 1985 Beebe & Takahashi, 1989; Beebe et al., 1990), Jung found that these social factors did not significantly influence a speaker's choice of linguistic patterns. She, thus, suggested that the claim that there are universal principles of politeness made by Brown and Levinson is not likely to be valid.

In sum, the differences in the findings from previous studies illustrate that the role of social status, social distance, and the imposition of act in speakers' linguistic choices is not warranted. It can vary culture to culture. This leads to the implication that EFL learners should be made aware of these cultural differences in order to avoid any miscommunication in cross-cultural interaction.

The present study, therefore, incorporated the two social variables: social status and social distance. The purpose is to investigate whether they affect the Thai English teachers' utterances because in Thai society, these two social variables are considered crucial factors influencing Thai people's performance. Thus, it is interesting to examine to what extent these two social factors play a role in the Thai English teachers' utterance production when speaking English with native speakers.

#### **2.2.4 Related Studies on the Speech Act regarding Requests**

The speech act of request has received great interest from researchers in the field of pragmatics. It has been studied extensively because it is regarded as one of the most face-threatening speech acts. Non-native speakers are likely to make mistakes and lose face if they fail to make an appropriate request. The speech act regarding requests that have been studied can be divided into two areas: making a request and refusing a request. A significant number of studies have been carried out. The majority of them are comparative or contrastive studies which aim to investigate different strategies of making or refusing requests performed by non-native and native speakers of English. These studies provide insightful information on pragmatics, as

well as the strategies employed in L2 learners' request performing. This section will briefly present some of the studies.

Kelly (2003) employed a written discourse completion task to explore the realization of requests made by 70 Japanese EFL students. It was noticed that the strategies most employed by the students were direct requests (e.g. I want you to ....) These strategies are usually found in the language of speakers at lower levels of pragmatic competence. Results showed that the students were perceived as being rude by native speakers of English despite trying to be polite. Looking into the responses produced by the students, Kelly further suggested that the limited linguistic competence of the target language was the main source of their pragmatic failure.

In a study of different direction, Luksaneeyanawin (2005) investigated the distinction of the structure and strategies of request made by 50 Thai university students and an equal number of American university students. A discourse completion task consisting of 9 different situations was administered to the two sample groups. Results showed that the strategies employed by the Thai learners differed from those employed by the American counterparts. Most of the Thai students (39%) preferred indirect strategies (e.g. Excuse me, I was wondering if I could borrow your book for the weekend. It would help me a lot with my thesis.). Conventionally indirect strategy (e.g. Professor Jones. May I borrow your book?) was found being employed by 37% of the Thai learners. On the other hand, most of the Americans (33%) often used direct strategy, such as "Give me the book, will you?"

Another study on requesting behavior by Yang (2008) investigated the acquisition of English requests by Chinese learners at three proficiency levels (advanced, intermediate and low). Data were collected through open production questionnaires. Results showed that learners' pragmatic development was influenced by their L2 linguistic proficiency, L1 pragmatic transfer and classroom instruction. The learners' employment of direct request strategies decreased. The employment of conventionally indirect strategies, the number and variety of internal modifiers increased with the increase of proficiency. It was also found that the learners' L1 influenced on various aspects of learners' request behavior. Yang claimed that

inadequate or inappropriate input from the teaching materials and the EFL classroom arrangements might constrain the learners' pragmatic development.

In another study, Jalilifar (2009) conducted a cross-sectional investigation into the request strategies employed by EFL Iranian learners and Australian native speakers of English. A discourse completion test was used in data collection procedure. Each request situation was designed with two social factors of social relative power and social distance to control the participants' linguistic choices. Results revealed both similarities and disparities between the two groups. In terms of similarities, it was found that as far as social power was concerned, EFL Iranian learners' request performance were similar to that of native speakers. However, it seemed that Iranian learners lacked some aspects of socio-pragmatic knowledge in request making when having to consider social distance.

To summarize, the strategies in request making of EFL learners in previous studies were found both similar to and different from those of English native speakers. Some different strategies were perceived inappropriate. It is, thus, necessary to make EFL learners aware of these differences so that they are able to avoid making mistakes in their international communication.

In addition to the studies which examined the behaviors of making a request of EFL learners and those of English native speakers, refusing a request is another aspect of request having been consistently investigated. The following paragraphs are reviews of previous research concerning this issue.

A study by Liao and Bresnahan (1996) investigated differences between refusal strategies employed by American native of English and Taiwanese EFL learners. Data were collected through a discourse completion test contained six scenarios of request refusing. Findings show that both Taiwanese and Americans used apologies as politeness markers in the similar frequency. Americans were less likely to refuse a friend; Taiwanese a family member. Americans and Taiwanese used different formulaic expressions in refusal and apply different strategies. In other words, Taiwanese tried not to give the peer a lesson; Americans tended to offer different reasons in refusal and did not hesitate to give a lesson if they were right. It



was found that more Taiwanese offered specific reasons in refusing a higher-status while Americans did not. Taiwanese were found to be more polite and modest when refusing a request in any situations. Liao and Bresnahan suggested that this verbosity was probably due to their culture.

In a similar study, Perriman (1999) investigated the differences between Saudi performances of the face-threatening act of refusal and those of American. Social status was incorporated in the study to influence the participants' choices of language. 15 Americans in the USA and 15 Saudis in Riyadh participated. The subjects were between 18 and 55 years of age. Data were gathered via two different collection procedures. The first set of data was natural speech collected by the researcher in different situations. The second was data obtained from a discourse completion test consisting of 10 refusal situations. Findings from this study indicated both similarities and differences among Saudis and Americans in making refusals. Interestingly, it seems that pragmalinguistic failure was not a problem for these groups. As a whole, Saudis and Americans were remarkably similar in the types of refusal strategies used. Both groups often gave reasons for indirect strategies in making refusals. Perriman concluded that Saudis were probably able to successfully transfer many of their refusal strategies to the other language.

Another study by Wannaruk (2005) investigated the pragmatic transfer made by Thai EFL learners in the speech act of refusal. One hundred and twenty graduate students took part in the study. They were asked to provide data to a six-item discourse completion task focusing on refusal situations. Forty Thai students gave native Thai data. Another forty Thais provided data in English. The rest forty were American students who gave English data. Their responses were compared to baseline data from the forty native English students. Results showed that pragmatic transfer occurred in Thai EFL learners' responses. The Thais usually employed making an apology then followed by giving reasons (e.g. Sorry. I'll be very busy tomorrow.).

In another study with different focus, Luksaneeyanawin (2005) studied the strategies in refusing a request. Like some earlier studies, a discourse completion task was employed in data collection. Ten different situations in which the participants had

to refuse a request were included. The participants consisted of 50 American university students and 50 Thai university students. Results indicated that American and Thai students shared both the same and different refusal strategies. The Thais often employed indirect refusal because in Thai culture it seems impolite to only say 'no' to an interlocutor. The strategies used by most of the Thai students (35%) were making an apology plus giving reasons.

In a study by Al-Eryani (2007), the speech act of refusing to invitations, offers, suggestions, including requests was investigated. Twenty Yemeni learners of English were asked to respond in English to a discourse completion test. The test consisted of six different situations in which the participants carry out the speech act of refusal. Their English performance was compared to that of Yemeni Arabic native speakers and American English native speakers. This comparison was to find out whether the refusal by the Yemeni learners of English, correspond more closely with those of the Yemeni Arabic native speakers or with the American English native speakers. Results indicated that Yemeni EFL learners' responses were similar to those of Americans in terms of range of refusal strategies. However, cross-cultural variation was evident in the frequency and content of semantic formulas used by each group in relation to the contextual variables. Al-Eryani then concluded that this phenomenon was probably due to the fact that Yemeni EFL learners transferred their cultural background when making refusals.

Another study was conducted by Chang (2009) to examine the differences between Chinese and Americans in refusals to requests. It also investigated pragmatic transfer made by the Chinese learners. Eighty-one Chinese EFL students participated in the study. Baseline English data were obtained from 40 American students. Another 40 Chinese students also provided baseline Chinese data. Results showed that the semantic formula utilized by Chinese EFL learners was less direct compared to those used by the Americans. The Chinese EFL learners employed making an apology as a refusal strategy. They also give specific reason for the refusal. Although Chang did not point out that these differences could cause pragmatic failure, her findings imply that EFL learners should primarily be made aware of the distinctions between

their first language and the target language. With this type of knowledge, they learn how to avoid making pragmatic errors.

It can be seen from the above studies that EFL learners share the same refusal strategies. They frequently employed indirect strategies, that is, they made an apology for not being able to accept the speaker's request. They also provided reasons or explanations why they could not make it. This is probably because in their culture, it seems impolite to directly refuse an interlocutor's request.

In conclusion, the previous studies on making and refusing requests suggest that EFL learner's requesting behaviors deviate from English native speakers'. These deviations may lead to their not achieving the goal in their intercultural communication.

All in all, it can be seen from the above review that none of the studies were carried out to investigate the pragmatic competence of EFL teachers. Apart from making and refusing requests, the aspect of accepting a request is also another unexplored area. It is, thus, worthwhile to investigate these areas. Moreover, the present study employed an oral discourse completion test which is scarcely used in the previous studies mentioned as a main instrument to measure the pragmatic competence of the Thai English teachers in making, accepting, and declining requests.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The current study was carried out to find answers for three research questions: (1) To what extent do Thai English teachers have pragmatic competence in making, accepting and declining?, (2) What factors influence their pragmatic competence in the three aspects of requests?, and (3) Do the interlocutor's social status and social distance influence the teachers' utterances? This chapter is divided into four sections of the research methodology: the subjects, the instruments, the data collection, and the data analysis and statistical procedure.

#### **3.1 Subjects**

The current study was carried out to find answers for three research questions: (1) To what extent do Thai English teachers have pragmatic competence in making, accepting and declining?, (2) What factors influence their pragmatic competence in the three aspects of requests?, and (3) Do the interlocutor's social status and social distance influence the teachers' utterances? This chapter is divided into four sections of the research methodology: the subjects, the instruments, the data collection, and the data analysis and statistical procedure.

#### **3.2 Research Instruments**

The present study employed three sets of instrument: An oral discourse completion test (ODCT), questionnaire, and interview. All of the instruments were administered in the pilot study to test the reliability and the validity. They, then, were used in the actual test after being revised. Below is the description of each instrument.

### **3.2.1 An Oral Discourse Completion Test (ODCT)**

The present study employed an ODCT which is one of the six test types used to assess L2 learners' pragmatic knowledge (Liu, 2006). This test type was used in a data collection in some studies, for example, Gajaseneni (1994). It was found that an ODCT is able to elicit more real life data compared to other types of test used to measure pragmatic ability, e.g. multiple-choice DCT.

The objective of using an ODCT in the present study is to elicit natural answers from the participants in order to measure their true pragmatic ability. The ODCT employed in the present study contained 27 situations for the speech act of requests: nine each for the sub-speech acts of making, accepting, and declining requests. Each test item was designed with social status and social distance indicated. A description of each situation was written in Thai in order to ensure that the intended meaning could be conveyed to the participants.

### **3.2.2 Questionnaire**

Aside from the ODCT, the current study also utilized a questionnaire. The questionnaire was constructed in the Thai language. It consisted of four main parts, totally 30 items. The first part consisting of 11 items, was mainly about the participants' personal information: age, gender, and English educational background. Eight items in the second part were constructed to obtain the data about the participants' English teaching experience, and activities concerning using English in their workplaces. The third part which consisted of 2 items, focused on exploring the participants' activities in using English in daily life. In this section, the participants were required to indicate how often they used English in their daily life. The last part, composed of 9 items, was aimed to obtain the information about the participants' awareness of learning and using the English language. In this part, the participants were asked to rank each item from 5 'the most' to 1 'the least' in order to indicate the

degree of their awareness. Before the actual distribution of the questionnaire, three experienced teachers were consulted to check the validity of the questionnaire contents. It was subsequently revised as shown in Table 3.1 below.

The questionnaire was also measured whether it was reliable. The results showed that the questionnaire is highly reliable with a reliability coefficient of .8034.

**Table 3.1. Changes in Questionnaires**

<b>Before</b>	<b>After</b>
<p><b>Part 4: Language Awareness</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">---</p> <p>22. The inspiration for your English learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Your parents</li> <li>- Your Thai English teachers</li> <li>- Your English native speaker teachers</li> <li>- Your friends</li> <li>- Your relatives</li> <li>- Yourself</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">---</p> <p style="text-align: center;">---</p> <p>32. Which of the following incidents did you encounter <b>the most often</b> when speaking English?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> A foreigner did not understand what you said.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> A foreigner said something different from what you expected to hear from him/her.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> You could not think of the expressions you wanted to say.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> You often thought in Thai and literally translated it into English.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> You successfully communicated with a foreigner.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Others (please specify)_____</li> </ul>	<p><b>Part 4: Language Awareness</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">---</p> <p>Item no. 22 and 32 were removed.</p>

### 3.2.3 English Proficiency Score

The participants' English scores from the English proficiency test created by the Department of Languages and Linguistics, the Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University for selecting post-graduate students to study in the Master of Art Degree program in Teaching English as an International Language, special program in the 2010 academic year was utilized as one instrument indicating the participants' linguistic ability.

The test battery consisted of three parts: Listening, grammar and structure, and writing. In the listening part, the participants had to listen to short and long conversations, and answered the multiple-choice questions. In the part of grammar and structure, the participants had to do the multiple-choice test measuring their grammar ability. Lastly, they had to write one page of essay in the writing part.

### 3.2.4 Interview

The last instrument used in the present study was an interview. It was employed to seek answers for two questions. The first question asked whether the interlocutors' social status influenced their utterance in each situation, and in what way. The other question asked whether the interlocutors' social distance influenced their utterance in each situation, and how it did.

The interview was conducted in Thai and the information was taken in a written form. The time spent on the interview with each participant was about three to five minutes. Each of them was asked to select one of the three scales: *Yes*, *Uncertain* and *No*. The information gained from this part was further tested statistically to locate the correlation with the scores each informant gained from the ODCT. The data obtained from the question concerning how social status and social distance influenced their utterances were subsequently qualitatively analyzed to investigate the participants' perception of the connection of the two social factors and the utterances.

### 3.2.5 The Test of Pearson Correlation Coefficient

Pearson Correlation Coefficient test was employed in the data analysis procedure of the present study. It was used to provide answers for Research question 2 and 3. The test helps indicate a relationship between two variables (X and Y), and the direction of their relation. The correlation value ( $r$ ) ranges from -1 to 1. If  $r$  is more than 0, it can be interpreted that the two variables are positively related. On the contrary, if  $r$  is less than 0, a correlation of the two variables is negative. The interpretation of the correlation coefficient is presented below.

$r \geq 0.8$ or $r \leq -0.8$	Strongly related
$0.5 < r < 0.8$ or $-0.5 < r < -0.8$	Moderately related
$r \leq 0.5$ or $r \geq -0.5$	Weakly related

(McMillan & Schumacher, 1997)

### 3.3 Pilot Study

After the construction of the instruments, and the test of the questionnaire's reliability, the three instruments were piloted. The purposes of conducting the pilot study were (1) to enable the researcher to designate appropriate testing time, (2) to explore the ambiguity of the content of the ODCT, and a questionnaire for further improvement and revise, and (3) to examine the validity of the score criteria.

The pilot study was carried out with five Thai teachers of English who were enrolled in the Master of Arts program in Teaching English as An International Language at a Thai university in the 2008 academic year. All of them were assumed to have similar background to the participants under the present study regarding English teaching experience.

In addition, a native speaker of English holding a master's degree in literature and two experienced teachers were consulted to determine whether each situation



presented in the ODCT was appropriate and reliable to assess the pragmatic competence of the participants in making, accepting and declining requests, and to examine whether the scoring criteria used in the present study was valid.

### **3.4 Data collection procedure**

After the pilot study, the three sets of instrument employed in the present study were administered respectively. To obtain the answers for the three research questions guided in Chapter 1, the procedure in data collection was divided in to three major stages as described in the following paragraphs.

#### **3.4.1 Oral Discourse Completion Test**

In the first stage, the ODCT was administered to the participants in a language laboratory. After a thorough explanation of the test procedure, they were allowed to try speaking English in five situations in order to get them familiar with the process before a real test administration. In addition, the actual test contained a Thai description of each situation in which the participants required to say what they would say in English in each situation. Varying time slots of 10, 15 or 20 seconds were given for reading each test prompt depending on the length of the prompt. The participants, then, responded to each prompt within 15 seconds by speaking into a tape recorder.

#### **3.4.2 Questionnaire and English Proficiency Score**

On the same day after the ODCT test administration, all of the participants were requested to complete a questionnaire which was aimed to obtain the personal data and information about their exposure to English.

In addition to the information from the questionnaires, the participants' scores from a test measuring English proficiency created by the Department of Language and Linguistics, the Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla university for selecting

post-graduate students to study in the Master of Art program in Teaching English as an International Language, special program in the 2010 academic year were also collected to be further correlated with the scores from the ODCT in order to examine whether it was a factor influencing the pragmatic competence of the participants in making, accepting, and declining requests.

### **3.4.3 Interview**

A few days after the ODCT test administration, the participants were also individually interviewed. The objective of the interview was to obtain the answers for the third research question exploring whether the interlocutor's social status and social distance influenced the participants' utterances in making, accepting and declining requests, and how they influenced. The data gathered for the first part of the question were correlated to the scores from the ODCT through Pearson correlation coefficient to discover the relationship between the two social factors and the utterances made by the participants. Moreover, the answers for the second part of the question, on the other hand, were qualitatively analyzed to explore the participants' perceptions of that relationship. All the information was recorded in written form.

## **3.5 Data analysis**

The data obtained from the ODCT, the questionnaire, the English proficiency scores, and the interviews were analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. Described below are the procedures of the data analysis.

**Research question 1:** To what extent do Thai English teachers have the pragmatic competence in making, accepting and declining requests?

In order to answer the first research question, the participants' utterances obtained from the ODCT were scored by five native speakers of English. Two out of these five native raters are American. The other two are Canadian, and the final one is British. Three of them hold a master's degree. The rest two have a bachelor's degree.

All of them work as English native speaker teachers. The following score criteria adapted from the Cohen and Olshtain Communicative Ability Scales (Cohen, 1994) was used in a scoring system.

- 0 = No answer
  - Wrong answers
  - Answers irrelevant to the given situation
  - Answers which do not convey a speaker's intention at all or change a speaker's intention
- 1 = Acceptable answers which contain all or one of the following characteristics, but can still convey the speaker's correct meaning and intention
  - Too much or too little information
  - Grammatical or lexical errors impairing but not preventing the interlocutor understanding the meaning or intention of the utterance
  - Too polite or rude
    - o Tone of voice
    - o Linguistic expression
- 2 = Appropriate answers which fully convey a speaker's correct meaning and intention and contain the following characteristics
  - Proper amount of information
  - Grammatical and lexical correctness or minor errors which do not affect the interlocutor's ability to understand the meaning or intention of the utterance
  - Polite
    - o Tone of voice
    - o Linguistic expression

After scoring, the scores of each participant were calculated to determine the mean value. This mean value was later transformed to the form of percentage to indicate the general scenario of the pragmatic competence of the participants in

making, accepting, and declining requests. Moreover, one-way ANOVA was adopted to determine the difference between means in the participants' pragmatic ability in the three aspects of requests.

**Research question 2:** What factors influence the pragmatic competence in making, accepting and declining requests of Thai teachers of English?

To answer the second research question, concerning the factors influencing the pragmatic competence of the Thai teachers in three aspects of requests, the English scores, and the information obtained from the completed questionnaires were coded and correlated with the scores from the ODCT, using Pearson's Correlation Coefficient.

**Research question 3:** Do the interlocutor's social status and social distance influence the utterances Thai English teachers made in making, accepting and declining requests? How?

To obtain the answer for the third research question, the data gathered from the interview were analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. The answers from the first part of the question concerning the influence of the interlocutor's social status and social distance on the utterances used by the participants were coded and correlated with the scores obtained from the ODCT. The test of Pearson's Correlation Coefficient was employed to examine the connection of the social status and the utterances, and of the social distance and such utterances. Moreover, the information gained for the question concerning how the interlocutor's social status and social distance influenced their utterances was qualitatively analyzed to find out the participants' perception of the influence of the two social variables on their utterances.

## CHAPTER 4

### FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter reports the findings and analyses of the results. The findings are presented in three sections according to the three research questions addressed, sections 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3. Section 4.4 is the discussion of the results.

#### 4.1 The Pragmatic Competence in Making, Accepting and Declining Requests of Thai English Teachers

The first research question was posited to investigate the pragmatic competence in making, accepting and declining requests of the participants.

In answering this research question, an oral discourse completion test (ODCT) was administered. The test was administered to measure the pragmatic competence in making, accepting, and declining requests of the English teachers. The percentage and the mean score were identified through a calculation and an analysis of the raw data elicited from the test administration as presented in Table 4.1 below.

**Table 4.1. English Teachers' Pragmatic Competence in Making, Accepting and Declining Requests**

N	Full Score	Min		Max		Mean		S.D.
		Score	%	Score	%	Score	%	
29	54	16	30	47	87	36.24	67	7.283

Table 4.1 shows the analysis of the ODCT results. Out of the total score of 54, the lowest score was 16 (30%), while the highest score was 47 (87%), and the mean score was 36.24 or 67%. The distribution of the pragmatic competence of the teachers is large ( $SD=7.283$ ). In other words, the pragmatic competence of some teachers is much higher than that of some teachers.

Further, the mean scores and percentages of each aspect were computed in order to determine whether there was a difference among the three aspects of requests: making, accepting and declining requests (Table 4.2 below).

**Table 4.2. Three Aspects of the Pragmatic Competence (N=29)**

Aspects of Request	Full Score	Min		Max		Mean		S.D.
		Score	%	Score	%	Score	%	
Making a request	18	4	22	17	94	11.21	64	2.691
Accepting a request	18	5	28	17	94	12.52	69	2.641
Declining a request	18	4	22	16	89	12.14	67	2.787

Table 4.2 shows a slight difference between means scores of making, accepting, and declining requests: 11.21 (64%), 12.52 (69%) and 12.14 (67%), respectively. The findings confirm that the Thai English teachers' pragmatic competence in requests differed slightly. The standard deviation of each aspect also suggests that the pragmatic competence in the three aspects of the teachers did not vary. These figures imply that when performing each aspect separately, the pragmatic competence of each teacher is relatively similar.

In addition, a one-way analysis of variance (one-way ANOVA) was carried out to capture a clearer picture of the teachers' pragmatic ability in the three aspects of requests. The results are shown in Table 4.3 below.

**Table 4.3. Different between Means of the Three Aspects of Request**

Tested Means	Sum of Squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Between group	22.687	2	11.342	1.527	.219
Within group	642.131	87	7.391		
Total	663.820	89			

Table 4.3 shows no difference between means of the three aspects of requests: making, accepting, and declining requests,  $F(2, 87) = 1.527$ ,  $p < 0.05$ . The figures confirm that the pragmatic ability of the Thai English teachers in the three aspects of requests was virtually at the equivalent level.

Based on the results, it can be concluded that the pragmatic competence of this group of English teachers is at a moderate level. It also suggested that the teachers' pragmatic competence in making, accepting, and declining requests is relatively similar.

## **4.2 Factors Influencing the Pragmatic Competence of Thai English Teachers in Making, Accepting, and Declining Requests**

The second research question aimed to investigate the factors influencing the pragmatic competence of the Thai English teachers participating in the present study.

To answer research question 2, two sets of data were collected. The first set was the participants' scores from the English proficiency test created by the Department of Languages and Linguistics, The Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University for selecting post-graduate students to study in the Master of Art program in Teaching English as an International Language in the 2010 academic year. The other set is the data obtained from the questionnaire. The two sets of data were statistically analyzed and correlated with the ODCT scores, using the Pearson's Correlation Coefficient test. The information for the analysis was divided into five categories: English language proficiency, educational backgrounds, teaching experience, daily activities using English, and awareness in using and learning the English language. These are presented in the subsequent sections--4.2.1-4.2.5, respectively.

### **4.2.1 English Language Proficiency**

Table 4.4 below shows the relationship between the participants' overall English proficiency and their pragmatic competence in requesting from the ODCT.

**Table 4.4. Correlation between English Proficiency and Pragmatic Competence**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Pragmatic competence</b>
<b>English proficiency</b>	<b>.404(*)</b>

\*Significant at  $p < 0.05$  level (N=30)

It is shown in Table 4.4 that the relationship between the participants' English proficiency and their pragmatic competence in the three aspects of requests was positively significant, at 0.05 level. This suggests that the participants with higher English proficiency tended to possess higher levels of pragmatic competence.

#### **4.2.2 Educational Backgrounds**

Five areas concerning the participants' educational background were examined by the questionnaire. They are (1) the participants' highest educational level, (2) the educational level at which they began to study English, (3) their experience studying English with a native speaker, (4) information about their educational institutions, and (5) their experiences living in English-speaking countries.

Based on the information gained from the questionnaire, it was found that all participants held a bachelor's degree with different majors. Twenty-four were English majors, and the other six majored in different subjects. Therefore, the issue of whether or not they majored in English was included as a factor influencing their pragmatic competence. The questionnaire data also reported that 24 of the teachers began to study English when they were in Prathomsuksa 5. Three teachers reported that they began studying English at their kindergarten level. Only one teacher began to study English when she was in Prathomsuksa 1, and the other one began studying English in her Matthayomsuksa 1.

During their study, 27 teachers used to study English with native speakers. Among these, 23 reported that they studied English with native speaker teachers during their university level. Five and seven teachers studied with natives when they were in primary and lower secondary levels, respectively. Ten had experience studying with native teachers in their upper secondary level. Only one reported that she studied English with a native speaker when she was at her vocational school. Regarding the school type, most of the teachers studied in government schools. One



said that he studied in a bilingual school. The final one studied in an international school.

Regarding the experience living in an English-speaking country, only four teachers used to live in English-speaking countries, but with different length of time. Two stayed there a few weeks for attending a seminar. One went there for a 3-month trip. The other one was there for 3 months for working, and he used English everyday. During staying in the English-speaking countries, all of them reported that they used English for greeting everyday. Two out of four said that they used English in their workplace everyday.

The above information was coded and correlated with the ODCT scores. The results are presented in Table 4.5 below.

**Table 4.5. Correlation between Educational Backgrounds and Pragmatic Competence (N=29)**

<b>Educational Background Variables</b>	<b>Pragmatic competence</b>
English / non-English major	<b>-.078</b>
Beginning to study English	<b>.185</b>
Studying English with natives	<b>-.181</b>
<b>Educational levels at which the participants began to study English</b>	
Primary	<b>-.003</b>
Lower secondary	<b>-.109</b>
Upper secondary	<b>-.177</b>
Vocational	<b>-.033</b>
University	<b>-.018</b>
<b>Types of school</b>	
Bilingual	<b>.200</b>
International	<b>.086</b>
Government	<b>-.291</b>
Staying in an English-speaking country	<b>.056</b>
Length of residence	<b>-.053</b>
Types of residence	<b>-.056</b>
<b>Types of activity</b>	
Greeting	<b>-.056</b>
Talking about work	<b>-.124</b>
Talking about personal issues	<b>-.065</b>

According to Table 4.5, no correlation was found between each item included in the participants' educational backgrounds and their pragmatic competence in making, accepting, and declining requests. It, thus, can be concluded that their major field of study, or the educational level at which they began to study English did not affect their pragmatic competence in the three areas of request. It was also found that their experience studying English with native speakers, and the experience of living in an English-speaking country did not influence such competence of the participants.

### **4.2.3 Teaching Experience**

The participants in the present study were English teachers; therefore, their English teaching may be a factor which contributed to the development of their pragmatic competence. They may acquire some aspects of pragmatic knowledge from their teaching. Thus, five aspects of teaching experience were included to investigate their influence on the teachers' pragmatic competence: (1) the length of English teaching, (2) the educational level of the students the participants taught, (3) the English skills they taught, (4) their perception of the benefits of English teaching on their English ability, and (5) the opportunity to use English with native speakers in the workplace (Table 4.6).

In terms of length of English teaching experience, the majority of the participants had less than five years of experience, and most of them taught at the primary level. The majority reported that they hardly had opportunities to use English in the workplace, and the ones they did usually involved greeting a native speaker of English. Table 4.6 illustrated the relationship between the pragmatic competence of the participants and their teaching experience.

**Table 4.6. Correlation between Teaching Experience and Pragmatic Competence**  
(N= 29)

<b>Teaching Experience Variable</b>	<b>Pragmatic competence</b>
Duration of teaching English	<b>.093</b>
<b>Educational level</b>	
Primary	<b>-.137</b>
Lower secondary	<b>.082</b>
Upper secondary	<b>.285</b>
Vocational	<b>-.226</b>
University	<b>-.079</b>
<b>English Skills</b>	
Listening	<b>.364</b>
Speaking	<b>.364</b>
Reading	<b>-.391(*)</b>
Writing	<b>-.391(*)</b>
All skills	<b>-.015</b>
Does your English teaching benefit your English use?	<b>.321</b>
Benefit of English teaching to your English use	<b>-.346</b>
Using English in the workplace	<b>-.013</b>
<b>Type of activity</b>	
Greeting	<b>.139</b>
Talking about work	<b>-.052</b>
Talking about personal issues	<b>.084</b>

\*Significant at  $p < 0.05$  level

Table 4.6 shows that the length of the time the participants spent on English teaching had no relationship with their pragmatic competence in making, accepting, and declining requests.

In addition, no relationship was found between their pragmatic competence and other variables; the educational level of students they taught, their perception of the benefit of their English teaching on their English ability, and the opportunity to use English with their English native speaker colleagues, for instance.

Interestingly, the above table shows that the teachers' pragmatic competence and English reading and writing skills were negatively correlated at the 0.05 level.

A possible reason for such connection could be instruction materials. The course books the teachers used for teaching these two skills may not provide much

knowledge on pragmatic aspects. A reading lesson normally focuses on providing students with reading strategies. In a writing class, a good organization of a piece of writing is a main focus. Thus, it might have led to the teachers' unawareness. Despite plenty of pragmatic tokens, teachers failed to make use of them.

#### 4.2.4 Activities Using English in Daily Life

The third part of the questionnaire was designed to obtain data concerning the participants' exposure to English. It mainly focused on discovering the activities which provided the participants a chance to use English in their daily lives. Out of the 29 Thai English teachers, only 14 reported that they occasionally used English in their daily lives. However, whether or not the participants had an opportunity to use English in their daily lives did not influence their pragmatic competence in the aspects of request behavior, as seen in Table 4.7.

**Table 4.7. Correlation between Teachers' Opportunities to Use English in Daily Life and Pragmatic Competence (N=29)**

Variable	Pragmatic competence
Whether or not the teachers had opportunities to use English in daily life	.206

According to the result from Table 4.7, the reason for a lack of relationship between the participants' opportunities to use English in daily life and the pragmatic competence is probably because the amount of time they spent in using English was not sufficient to develop their pragmatic competence. Another reason is that those input to which the participants exposed may not be appropriate to improve such competence. Therefore, the pragmatic competence of the participants cannot be effectively developed.

To further determine whether the activities the participants performed in their daily lives influenced their pragmatic competence in the three aspects of requests, the questionnaire data concerning activities using English in daily life were coded and related to the pragmatic scores.

The questionnaire data show that only one participant face-to-face talked to a native speaker of English 2-3 times a week. The rest of them reported that they rarely had this opportunity. One participant chatted on-line in English everyday. Three spent a few times in a week to do so, and four did this activity 2-3 times a month. Regarding using e-mail, one participant said that she wrote e-mails in English everyday. The other two did this activity a few times a week, and the rest rarely did so.

In another activity—talking in English on the telephone, only one participant reported she did this activity a few times a week. Three said that they talked on the telephone in English 2-3 times a month. The rest of them never did this activity. Pertaining to watching movies, seven of the participants said that in a week they watched movie in English 2-3 times. Three of them did this activity a few times a month, and only one did so a few times a year. In a similar activity, one participant reported that she watched series in English a few times a week. Three did so 2-3 times a month.

About reading activities, four participants read novels written in English a few times a week. Three did so a few times a month. One participant said that she read English magazines everyday. The other five read them a few times a week, and the other four did this activity a few times a month. In another reading activity, four of them read English conversation books everyday. Six participants did so a few times a week, and the other four read this kind of books 2-3 times a month.

In the last activity using English, seven participants reported that they accessed Internet everyday to search for information in English. The other seven did so a few times a week, and only one participant accessed Internet 2-3 times a month.

It can be seen from the above data that only some of the participants had opportunities to use English in daily life. However, it cannot be guaranteed that this exposure to English input is sufficient for the participants' pragmatic development.

These data were coded and correlated to the participants' pragmatic scores from the ODCT. The relationship is demonstrated in Table 4.8 below.

**Table 4.8. Correlation between Activities Using English in Daily Life and Pragmatic Competence (N=29)**

Using English Variables	Pragmatic competence
Face-to-face talking	-.066
Chatting online	-.139
E-mail	.036
Talking on the telephone	-.109
Watching movies	-.349
Watching TV series, talk shows	-.078
Reading novels, cartoons	-.171
Reading magazines	-.274
Reading conversation books	-.280
Using the Internet	-.174

Table 4.8 shows that the participants' pragmatic competence in making, accepting, and declining requests did not correlate with any activities using English in daily life.

The participants' degree of exposure to English in daily life might be too limited to contribute to their pragmatic development. This is probably because the number of the participants is small. Moreover, the time each participant spent on doing each activity is not frequent. The limitation on frequency and length of each exposure of this subject group were hardly quantified or measured, possibly leading to the result.

#### **4.2.5 Awareness in Language Use**

The data concerning the participants' language awareness were categorized according to the means derived from the participants' responses based on the rating scale employed. The scales then were interpreted according to the level of the participants' responses as follows:

1.00 – 1.80	Very low awareness	
1.81 – 2.60	Low awareness	
2.61 – 3.40	Moderate awareness	
3.41 – 4.20	High awareness	
4.21 – 5.00	Very high awareness	(Som-in, 1988)

Table 4.9 in the following section shows that the average awareness in language use of the teachers was high.

**Table 4.9. Frequency of Awareness in Language Use**

Description	Frequency (%)					$\bar{X}$	Std.	Level of Awareness
	1	2	3	4	5			
1. You think that if you are able to use English, you should use it accurately and appropriately.	3.4	0.0	6.9	24.1	65.5	4.48	.91	Very high
2. You study the culture of the target language.	3.4	10.3	34.5	41.4	10.3	3.45	.95	High
3. An interlocutor influences your utterance.	0.0	3.3	26.7	36.7	33.3	3.97	.87	High
4. You try to use English whenever you can.	0.0	6.7	13.3	36.7	43.3	4.17	.93	High
5. You notice your mistakes when using English and improve them next time.	0.0	6.7	20.0	46.7	26.7	3.97	.87	High
6. When you learn new English expressions, you write them down.	20.0	13.3	26.7	26.7	13.3	3.07	1.31	Moderate
7. You search for the meanings of the new expressions you learn and study how and when to use them.	10.0	23.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	2.93	1.00	Moderate
8. You try to speak those new expressions with your friends.	6.7	30.0	26.7	30.0	6.7	3.00	1.10	Moderate
9. You look for similarities and differences between Thai expressions and English.	0.0	13.3	40.0	30.0	16.7	3.52	.95	High
<b>Total</b>						<b>3.62</b>	<b>.99</b>	<b>High</b>

It can be seen from Table 4.9 that the participants' responses concerning their awareness in language use varied over three levels: moderate, high, and very high. The participants had very high awareness of the fact that if they use English, they should use it accurately and appropriately. They were highly aware of the importance of studying the culture of the target language, and of the fact that an interlocutor can influence their utterances. They also had high awareness of the importance of trying

to use English whenever they can, and of the importance of noticing mistakes when using English and improving them next time, In addition, they were highly aware of the importance of looking for similarities and differences between Thai and English expressions.

However, they only moderately agreed with the following: when they learn new English expressions, they write them down, they search for the meanings of the new expressions they learn and study how and when to use them, and they try to speak those new expressions with their friends.

Base upon the above information, it can be seen that the overall awareness in language use of the participants was at a high level. Previous studies (Bardovi-Harlig, 1996; Bardovi-Harlig & Dornyei, 1998) pointed out that learners who are well aware of the differences between the target language and their first language are likely to use the target language appropriately. According to this assumption, the participants in the present study were assumed to possess a high level of pragmatic competence in the three aspects of request because of their high level of awareness in language use.

However, the pragmatic competence of the participants in this study was not related to their degrees of awareness as shown in Table 4.10 below.

**Table 4.10. Correlation between Awareness in Language Use and Pragmatic Competence (N=29)**

	Pragmatic competence
Awareness in language use	-.198

Table 4.10 reports no relationship between the factors pertaining to the participants' awareness in language use and their pragmatic competence in requests. This suggests that this type of awareness might not play a role in the pragmatic competence of the English teachers. A possible reason which can be made for the lacking of relationship is the participants' insufficient and inappropriate exposure of English input.



### 4.3 The Influence of the Interlocutors' Social Status and Social Distance on the Utterances Made by the Thai English Teachers

The third research question was asked to seek whether the interlocutor's social status and social distance in each given situation influenced the utterances made by the teachers. The participants were asked two main questions presented below.

#### Table 4.11. Interview Information

The first one asked whether the interlocutor's social status in the given situations influenced their production of utterances. The second question asked whether the interlocutor's social distance affected their utterance. They were requested to indicate one of the three scales (no, uncertain, and yes) for the questions, as shown below.

#### Questions asked

1. During the ODCT, did you consider the interlocutor's social status in each given situation before making the utterance?
2. During the ODCT, did you take into account the interlocutor's social distance in each situation before making the utterance?

N	Question	No	Uncertain	Yes
29	1	0	7	22
29	2	0	7	22

Based on the interview information, seven participants reported that they were uncertain whether their utterances were socially appropriate for the given situations. The other 22 indicated that they took the social situation into account when creating their utterances.

Furthermore, in order to determine whether the two social contextual factors play any role on the participants' utterances, the answers were interpreted and related to the scores gained from the ODCT, as shown in Table 4.12.

**Table 4.12. Correlation between the Social Factors (Status and Distance) and the Utterances Made by the Thai English Teachers (N=29)**

Social Variables	Pragmatic competence
Status	.120
Distance	.120

According to the results of the Pearson's correlation coefficient test, no relationship between the awareness of the two social factors and the utterances produced by the participants was found.

When asked how the hearer's social status and social distance in each given situation influenced their utterances, the participants gave rather similar explanations. Regarding social status, they said they should be polite to the interlocutors in a higher status, and that formal utterances were necessary when the social distance between the participants and the interlocutor was large. In addition, they all agreed that that they could be less formal to those in the same or lower status and that moderate, and informal utterances can be used when the social distance was small. Presented below is some verbatim translated feedback of the participants' original Thai version.

### **Participant 2**

*"I think that I have to be very polite to someone of higher status, but I can be less polite to someone who was in equal or lower status. I can also use informal language patterns with my friends or someone close to me. On the other hand, I must be formal when speaking to a stranger. I encountered the problem during the test. I am not satisfied with my performance. I should have done better."*

### **Participant 9**

*"With people whose social status is higher than mine, I have to be formal. I can be less formal to people in the same or lower status. Regarding social distance, I think informal utterances can be used with intimate people. During the ODCT, I could not think of some vocabulary items and linguistic patterns to use in certain situations."*

**Participant 13**

*“I think I have to speak politely with everyone, but I can be informal to people I am familiar with. I have to be formal to people of higher status, and I also have to be polite to a stranger. The problem I had during the test is that I was unable to recall appropriate responses from my background knowledge, despite the fact that I had learned this knowledge. I do not have a chance to encounter these kinds of situations in my life.”*

**Participant 22**

*“Regarding social status, I must be very polite to people whose status is higher than mine, such as my teachers. I can be less polite to people of the same or lower status. And I think that I can be less polite to someone I know very well, such as a friend or relatives, but I have to be polite to a stranger. I think I didn’t do a good job in the test because I could not think of what I wanted to say. I possess the knowledge, but I could not recall it because I rarely use it.”*

**Participant 28**

*“I believe that I must be polite to someone whose social status is higher than mine, and to someone who is not close to me. In contrast, I can be informal to people of equal or lower status. I can also be informal to intimate people. I think some of my utterances were not appropriate, but at that moment, I could only think of some simple sentences.”*

From the participants’ explanations, it could be concluded that the participants had high awareness of English use of requesting. It was also seen from the participants’ responses that they encountered the difficulties (e.g. not being able to recall some vocabulary items, not being able to make grammatically-correct sentences) during producing the utterances. It, thus, can be concluded that the participants’ insufficient linguistic ability had limited what they wished to express.

## 4.4 Discussion

### 4.4.1 The Overall Pragmatic Competence in Making, Accepting and Declining Requests of Thai English Teachers

The results obtained from the ODCT indicate that the overall pragmatic competence of the Thai English teachers in making, accepting, and declining requests was at an average level: 36.24 (67%). According to the five English native-speaking raters, this figure can be interpreted as the group had a moderate level of pragmatic competence in the three aspects of requests. This finding is, to a certain degree, consistent with Dong's (2006) study which reported that the pragmatic competence of the Chinese English teachers was relatively low due to their lack of pragmatic knowledge.

In a further examination of the participants' utterances, three major problems were recognized as possible causes for their pragmatic competence inadequacy.

First, most of their utterances were overly polite in informal situations, and some utterances sounded rude in formal situations. This problem was also found in other studies which investigated the pragmatic competence of EFL/ESL learners. In an investigation of pragmatic transfer in refusal by Thai EFL learners, for example, Wannaruk (2005) found that the participants tried to be more polite when communicating in English. Similarly, in a contrastive study of request strategies between Thai and American students, Luksaneeyanawin (2005) found that the Thai EFL learners used indirect strategies to try to make their requests more polite.

A contrasting result was found in Mei-Xiao's (2008) study. She found that her Chinese EFL learners were perceived as being rude by native speakers of English because of their unawareness of the cultural differences between English and Chinese. Below are examples of the utterances produced by the participants in the present study.

### **Example 1: Too polite token, and rude token**

**Situation:** You are having dinner with your close foreign friend. What do you say to ask your friend to pass you the sugar?

In this situation, the participants were required to make a request of a friend. This context was considered informal because this friend had an equal status and close social distance.

Participant 4: *Excuse me. Could you please give me a favor? I need some sugar.*

Participant 3: *Pass me some sugar.*

The utterance produced by Participant 4 was overly polite. He said, “Could you please give me a favor?,” which is normally used only in very formal situation. This utterance was considered too formal for this context according to native speaker norms. Moreover, it was incorrect. The accurate one was “Could you please do me a favor?”

In contrast, the utterance made by Participant 3 sounded slightly rude because it was a command. Although the addressee in this context was a close friend, the speaker should still be moderately polite when asking a favor. Three of the English native raters suggested that a politeness marker, such as “please” or a tag, such as “will you?,” would help soften this expression. This participant might be influenced by her L1 since a politeness marker “please” or *‘karuna’* in Thai is not used between close friends.

According to Example 1, it can be assumed that the participants might lack both linguistic knowledge and pragmatic knowledge. On the one hand, their limited linguistic competence influenced their making incorrect sentence. On the other hand, due to the participants’ lack of pragmatic knowledge, although grammatically-correct, some utterances were considered inappropriate and failed to express the participants’ intended meanings. Although the sentence “Pass me some sugar.” may be considered appropriate to speak to a close friend in Thai culture, the participants should be made aware that when speaking English, they should take into account its culture.

The second problem was that some of the participants' utterances contained improper amount of information. They either contained inadequate information, when they failed to convey the speaker's real intention; or were overly verbose, where too much information was given. This finding was consistent with the finding of Blum-Kulka & Oshtain (1986), who suggested that deviating from native norms of utterance length can cause several types of pragmatic failure. It was also supported by Prachanant (2006), who observed excessive productions from Thai university students in his contrastive study of complaint responses between Thai and American learners. More clarification can be seen in Example 2 and 3 below.

**Example 2: Too much information**

**Situation:** At work, you want a subordinate to copy a document for you. What would you say?

In this context, the participant had to make a request of his subordinate whose social status is considered lower, and the social distance is moderate.

Participant 4: *Excuse me, sir. Could you please give me a favor? I really need a copy of this paper. You're so close with a copy machine.*

The sentence, "You're so close with a copy machine," produced by Participant 4 was considered excessive for the situation by most of the raters.

**Example 3: Too little information**

**Situation:** Today you need to take a half-day leave to go to your friend's wedding party. What would you say to your boss?

In this situation a speaker who was subordinate had to make a request to his/her senior supervisor, a person with higher status. In terms of closeness, these two persons are considered having a moderate distance between each other.

Participant 25: *Sir, I'd like to leave the office.*

This utterance was considered too short to fully convey the speaker's intended meaning. It also sounded strange because it did not contain a request expression, and it did not furnish necessary details. This might be due to the speaker's lack of English vocabulary and fixed expressions.

Given the information seen in the two examples above, it may be concluded that the participants' over-production of utterances (Example 2) was due to their lack of pragmatic knowledge which can lead to L1 transfer, while linguistic deficiency was responsible for situations when a lack of necessary information was given (Example 3).

The last problem found with the participants' utterances was related to grammar. While certain participants produced minor-grammatical errors, others made serious ones, potentially leading to communication breakdown. This finding was consistent with previous studies (Kelly, 2003; Kwai, 2008; Mei-Xiao, 2008) in which learners' deficiency in linguistic knowledge of a target language caused misunderstanding in cross-cultural communication. The linguistic inadequacy sometimes made speakers to resort to their mother tongue leading to L1 transfer. In this case, when speakers lacked linguistic pattern to utilize in given situations, they translated linguistic form of the Thai language to what they assumed an English equivalent. This lends support to a study by Kelly (2003) who found that Japanese EFL learners were judged as rude because when they made a hard effort to communicate in English, they translated Japanese linguistic form to English equivalent. These types of translated sentences sounded awkward to native speakers, as seen in Example 4 and 5 below.

**Example 4: Linguistic inadequacy (incorrect choice of words)**

**Situation:** Emmy, your niece is listening to music. The music is very loud and is disturbing you. What would you say to Emmy to get her to turn down the volume?

Participant 7: *Emmy, could you **slowly** your music, please? It's so loud.*

Participant 20: *Emmy, reduce the radio, please.*

The two utterances above were incorrect. Participant 7 used the word “slowly” instead of “turn down”, while Participant 20 used the word “reduce.” These two examples demonstrate the participant’s inability to use correct vocabulary items or part of speech to convey their intended meaning.

**Example 5: Linguistic inadequacy (incorrect choice of verbs)**

**Situation:** Today you need to take a half-day leave to go to your friend’s wedding party. What would you say to your big boss?

Participant 8: *My friend will marry in the afternoon. Can I stop my work?*

Participant 19: *Boss. Today I would like to break off in the afternoon because I go to my friend’s wedding.*

The two utterances above were considered understandable for the given context because they were able to convey the participants’ intention. Participant 8 used “stop my work” which distorted her intention. In the same way, the utterance made by Participant 19 contained the phrasal verb, “break off,” which in English means to stop speaking, but this speaker used it in the meaning of “taking leave.”

**Example 6: Linguistic inadequacy (incorrect sentence form)**

**Situation:** A foreign student, whom you used to take care of during a science camp, but have not spoken to since then, asks you to write a reference for him to join an English camp. You are glad to do it. What would you say?

Participant 12: *Okay. I’m really appreciate to help you.*



The sentence made by Participant 12 above represents such L2 deficiency of the speaker. She mixed using verb to be (am) with finite verb (appreciate). According to the native raters, this expression sounded unusual.

Although grammatical incorrectness is considered a minor problem for pragmatic competence and may not hinder communication, incorrect or awkward use of verbs sometimes fails to convey speakers' intention leading to their not achieving the set cross-cultural communication goal as demonstrated by the examples above.

In addition to the stated problems, it was found that some of the participants did not respond at all in some situations. Two reasons were made for the lack of response. First, it was due to the participants' limited linguistic knowledge. If that is the case, linguistic competence is clearly a dominant factor in pragmatic competence. The other was that the participants were too anxious to produce utterances in the given situations, imposed by the time constraint.

One interesting point which should also be addressed is that none of the utterances produced by the participants were penalized for the tone of voice. The native raters commented that the responses lacked any intonation, perhaps because the given situations were not 100% realistic. Therefore, tone of voice was excluded from the marking by the raters. Although tone of voice was not the factor affecting the politeness of the utterances produced by the teachers, it is necessary to make the teachers aware that tone of voice is another factor which can also determine the degree of politeness (BBC, 2010).

In conclusion, this group of Thai English teachers was seen to have encountered the same problems as EFL speakers in previous studies. The problems these teachers struggled with can be categorized into three major types. These were (1) a lack of pragmatic knowledge, (2) transfer from L1, and (3) linguistic deficiency, especially wrong choices of words. These findings lend support to Nguyen's (2008) findings which also reported that the interplaying factors causing his Vietnamese EFL learners to employ different criticizing strategies from native speakers of English were their limited L2 linguistic competence, lack of L2 pragmatic knowledge, and the influence of L1 pragmatics. The problems found in Nguyen's study and in the current

study confirm that both pragmatic competence and linguistic competence are vital factors for successful and effective international communication. Accordingly, the results from this group of Thai English teachers suggest that Thai English teachers in general should be encouraged to develop their pragmatic and linguistic ability because these teachers may be the only available source students can rely on for pragmatic development.

#### **4.4.2 Strategies Employed by the Thai English Teachers to Perform the Three Aspects of Requests**

In addition to their overall pragmatic competence in making, accepting, and declining requests, the present study investigated differences in the participants' pragmatic ability among the three aspects of requesting. Although the results from an ANOVA test showed no differences, the participants were obviously better in performing accepting requests. This is probably because words used in accepting requests are usually short and uncomplicated, e.g., yes, okay (Allwood, Nivre and Ahlsen, 1993). Despite sounding blunt, these short utterances are considered appropriate and effective to convey intended meanings in certain situations. Nevertheless, in a closer look into the participants' utterances, it was found that apart from saying "yes" or "okay", they usually gave more explanation or details to express their acceptance more completely, as illustrated by the following examples.

##### **Example 7: Accepting requests**

**Situation:** Emmy, your niece, asks you to help her with her homework. You are free and want to help. What do you say?

Participant 2: *Yes. I'm free to **teach** the homework to you.*

Participant 7: *Sure. I will **teach** your homework for you.*

The first part of the utterances, “yes” and “sure,” was acceptable, as they accurately convey the speakers’ intentions. However, the second part of their utterances which contain the word “teach” sounded unusual to the English raters; the participants’ literally translated it to English from the Thai word “sorn.” Linguistically, the word “teach” in English means “to show somebody how to do something so that they will be able to do it themselves” (Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, 1995). The meaning of this word is hence not accurate in this situation. “Help you with your homework” is more appropriate.

In an analysis of the participants’ utterances for accepting a request, it was found that all of them utilized “Okay” to accept the interlocutors’ request. 72% of the participants said some expressions, for example, “I will help you,” or “I can do it for you.” after saying “Okay”. Ten participants (35%) said “It’s my pleasure.” when accepting a request from higher-status interlocutors. This strategy is also found in the study of Allwood and et. al. who posit that “Okay” is a common word used for accepting.

While short utterances can be used for accepting requests, the single word “no” can be used for declining a request, However, simply saying “no” for a refusal may risk offending the counterparts (Wannaruk, 2005). As a result, speakers employ other strategies to avoid such risk. Expressing an apology, giving reasons for a refusal, giving an alternative to the person are a few of such strategies (Wannaruk, 2005; Luksaneeyanawin, 2005). The participants in the present study, although managed to employ these strategies, they sometimes struggled with communication difficulties in elaborating the strategies with the situations. Their linguistic deficiency or their lack of pragmatic knowledge may be the major causes of their weakness, as shown below.

### **Example 8: Declining requests**

**Situation:** Your classmate, who has just begun studying in your college today, asks you to tutor her in biology, but you are in a hurry to get to work. What would you say to decline her request?

Participant 6: *Sorry. Now I'm **hurry up** to go outside.*

Participant 21: *Oh! Sorry. I can't **tu** the knowledge for you. ("To tu" means "to tutor.")*

These two utterances successfully convey the speakers' negative intention, but they might sound confusing for the listeners. The speakers used *making an apology* as a refusal strategy in the first part of the utterance. However, the following elaborations, expressing reasons for refusal, sounded awkward to the five native speakers. In English, the phrase "hurry up" in the first sentence means to do something quickly, but this speaker used it with the meaning that he was in a hurry. The word /tu/ in the utterance made by Participant 21 is a Thai word meaning "tutor" in English. These two utterances are examples of pragmatic transfer from the speakers' L1 to English which result in misunderstandings in their cross-cultural communication efforts.

### **Example 9: Declining requests**

**Situation:** Your friend's sister, whom you have known for a long time but rarely talk with, would like to borrow your cartoon book. You already gave that book to someone. What do you say to her?

Participant 6: ***Excuse me.** My friend borrowed my cartoon book already.*

Participant 14: *That's too bad because my friend **lent** me yesterday.*

Participant 6's utterance misused the politeness marker, "Excuse me," which is, in fact, irrelevant to the given context. The more suitable marker for the context is "Sorry." This mistake was probably due to the speaker's incomplete linguistic ability. Similarly, utterance made by Participant 4 was considered irrelevant to the given context. It contained a major lexical error. Instead of using "borrow it," the participant said "lent me," which does not convey his real intention.

A deeper look into the utterances for declining requests made by the participants revealed that all of the participants apologized (Sorry or I'm sorry)

instead of refusing in every given situation. They also gave the reasons for not being able to accept the requests. Seven participants (24%) were found giving alternatives (e.g. Can I do it later?) after expressing a regret. These strategies were also found in other studies investigating the strategies in refusal of EFL learners, for example Luksaneeyanawin (2005), Wannaruk (2005) and Chang (2009). This finding implies that making an apology may be a popular refusal strategy among EFL learners.

Phrases used for making requests, on the other hand, are generally longer and more complex than those used for accepting or declining requests. This is because some utterance may consist of an expression for making a request (Head Act). Aside from head acts, some utterances may contain expressions providing reasons of that request, other supporting information, or politeness markers (Supportive Moves) (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984). Participants in the present study employed this rule when making their requests, as demonstrated by the following examples.

#### **Example 10: Making requests**

**Situation:** You are going to college, but you forgot your book in the living room. You ask Mary, your sister-in-law, to get the book for you. What would you say?

Participant 18: *Excuse me. Could you **pick up** my book for me, please?*

Supporting Move + Head Act

Utterance made by Participant 18 contained a lexical error. She employed the phrasal verb, “pick up” which means to physically lift something. Thus, she received only one point out of two from the English raters.

#### **Example 11: Making requests**

**Situation:** Today, you need to take a half-day of leave to go to your friend’s wedding party. What would you say to your boss?

Participant 15: *Boss. I must go to wedding party, so I need to **free** in the afternoon.*

Supporting Move + Supporting Move + Head Act

The sentence, “I need to free in the afternoon,” is ungrammatical and sounds unusual according to the raters. An appropriate answer for this situation, as suggested by one of the raters should be “Boss, May I have a half day off today so I can go to my friend’s wedding party?”

It was found from the utterances made by the participants that such conventionally indirect strategy as *Could you ...?, May I ...? or Would you mind ...?* was the most frequently-employed strategy. This strategy was also found in the study of request making by Luksaneeyanawin (2005). In addition, twenty-six participants (97%) utilized direct strategy with the lower-status interlocutors. “Serve me some water.” was used by Participant 17 when requesting of a waiter, for instance. This finding is consistent with Kelly (2003) who also found direct strategy in Japanese EFL learners’ request making.

In summary, in searching for words to get their meanings across, the participants overlooked language forms which were appropriate for the given contexts, as illustrated by the previous examples. Moreover, as the situations were designed for the informants to assess their relationships with the interlocutors when producing utterances in making, accepting, and declining requests, they encountered additional difficulties. Kelly (2003) posits that attempting to take into consideration both meanings and forms is a big challenge for EFL learners. These reasons, together with their insufficient linguistic ability caused the participants in the present study to experience even more difficulties in producing appropriate and effective utterances in the three aspects of requests. Therefore, this may be the reason why no significant differences were found between the types of requests.

### **4.4.3 Factors Influencing the Teachers' Pragmatic Competence in the Three Aspects of Requests**

#### **4.4.3.1 Pragmatic Competence versus Linguistic Competence**

The results from a statistical performance show that the teachers with higher linguistic proficiency are likely to possess higher pragmatic competence in the three aspects of requests in question ( $r=.404$ ,  $p<0.05$ ). However, as the correlation between the two types of competence is weak, it cannot be convincingly concluded that linguistic competence greatly influenced the teachers' pragmatic competence. In other words, not every English teacher with high English proficiency will possess a high level of pragmatic ability. This result, thus, may suggest that linguistic competence was a necessary tool for this group of Thai English teachers to produce appropriate language forms for the given contexts.

An analysis of the findings from the present study revealed that a major cause of the participating English teachers' lack great success in pragmatic competence is due to their insufficient linguistic ability. The majority of their utterances failed to obtain a full score because they were grammatically incorrect. Although some received a full score, they contained minor grammatical errors, the evidence of their linguistic deficiency. Moreover, some of the participants did not respond in certain situations because they lacked linguistic pattern appropriate for the contexts. These observations reinforce that the assumption made by previous studies that linguistic competence is a prerequisite for pragmatic competence, and it does not result in a corresponding level of pragmatic competence (Hoffman-Hicks, 1992; Bardovi-Harlig, 1999; Kasper & Rose, 2002; Li, 2007; Kwai, 2008).

#### **4.4.3.2 Pragmatic Competence versus Authentic Input Exposure**

Aside from linguistic competence, exposure to a target language in natural context is one of the factors that affects learners' pragmatic competence. In particular, authentic input exposure has been accepted as benefiting learners' pragmatic

development (Alcon, 2005; Bardovi-Harlig, 1996; Edwards & Csizer, 2004; Eslami-Rasekh, 2004; Iwasaki, 2008; Kasper & Rose, 2002; McLean, 2004).

Thus, some items in the questionnaire (personal information, educational backgrounds, teaching experiences, and activities using English in daily life) employed in the present study were designed to elicit information about the participants' exposure to English (for more information, see Appendix C). According to the results from performing Pearson's Correlation Coefficient test, it was found that none of the factors concerning English exposure influenced the participants' pragmatic competence in the three aspects of requests. Previous studies (Bardovi-Harlig, 1996; Jung, 2002; Kasper & Rose, 2002) showed that the deficiency in input to which the participants exposed played an important role in this phenomenon. This deficiency can be classified into two types: Input lacking in quantity and input lacking quality.

Regarding the quantity, the participants may not have received adequate input to significantly improve their pragmatic competence. These Thai English teachers were like other EFL learners whose exposure to authentic input and opportunity to use English in real life were limited (Rose, 1994). The data from the questionnaire showed that only four participants used to live in an English-speaking country. Fourteen of them reported that they had opportunities to speak English at their workplace, but this mainly involved greeting native speakers only. Sixteen of the teachers said that they used English outside work, and only seven of these reported that they accessed the Internet everyday in English. This information demonstrated that this group of English teachers scarcely had opportunities to develop their English skills. This insufficiency of exposure might have resulted in their lack great success in pragmatic competence.

Moreover, the English experience that the participants have had throughout their lives may have given them limited pragmatic norms of the target language, so they often have limited language expressions for different situations. This observation lends support to Yang (2008) who also reported that the participants in his study encountered this problem.



With respect to the quality of input, even though the participants reported that they were exposed to authentic English, it did not mean that this input was appropriate for their pragmatic development. According to Kasper & Rose (2002), without explicit instruction on pragmatics, some of L2 learners, though were exposed to contact with native speakers, their acquiring appropriate language use would not be achieved.

In a study by Bardovi-Harlig (1996), she found that speech act realizations presented in textbooks did not reflect the actual utterance of native speakers. Those materials, thus, may lead learners to misinterpret the culture of the target language and its rules for speaking and politeness norms.

In another study, Porter (1986, as cited in Kasper & Rose, 2002) investigated how Spanish learners of English tried to provide native-like pragmatic input to each other during their problem-solving tasks, and found that the learners' speech acts and politeness style were different from those of native speakers, quoted below.

Learners' lack of appropriate language use patterns suggests that only native speakers (or perhaps very advanced nonnative speakers) can provide truly "appropriate" input that will build sociolinguistic competence...Communicative activities in the classroom will provide valuable production practice for learners, but they will not generate the type of socio-cultural input that learners need. (p.218)

In sum, the lack of great success in the pragmatic competence of the Thai English teachers in the present study might have been the effect of not exposing to sufficient quality input for their pragmatic development to occur.

#### **4.4.3.3 Pragmatic Competence versus Pragmatic Awareness**

Another factor that may influence pragmatic development is learners' pragmatic awareness. Previous studies suggest that raising learners' awareness on pragmatics communication is a way to help ESL or EFL learners develop their pragmatic competence (Rose, 1994; Kasper, 1997; Eslami-Rasekh, 2005). Raising pragmatic awareness can help learners recognize how language forms are used appropriately in context (Eslami-Rasekh, 2005). This technique also points out to learners the existence of similarities and differences between their mother tongue and

a target language. If learners are aware of the pragmatic differences between their language and the target language, they are likely to be more successful in their cross-cultural communication.

Nonetheless, the results from the present study revealed that a high level of the participants' awareness did not guarantee a corresponding level of pragmatic competence when it came to making, accepting, and declining requests. One possible reason from the present study is that the participants lacked both pragmatic knowledge and linguistic ability. It can also be seen that despite having possessed a high degree of awareness in language use, without pragmatic instruction, the pragmatic competence of these English teachers did not efficiently develop.

It can be concluded from the obtained data that the participants' English ability was positively correlated with their pragmatic competence in making, accepting, and declining requests, but at a weak level. The findings also reveal a negative relationship between English reading and writing skills and the participants' pragmatic competence. Aside from these two factors, none of the factors were found correlated to such competence of the participants. This is probably because the number of the participants in the present study is small.

Although the findings from this study did not give the contribution on the factors influencing the pragmatic competence, it did support some aspects which were suggested by previous studies. Firstly, it confirmed that linguistic competence is necessary for pragmatic acquisition. Second, it did reinforce that exposure to a target language was highly important for the development of pragmatic competence because the participants in the present study hardly had this type of exposure; they failed to get a high score in their pragmatic test.

#### **4.4.4 The Influence of the Interlocutors' Social Status and Social Distance on the Utterances Made by the Thai English Teachers**

The third research question asked whether the social status and social distance of the people in the given situations affected the utterances produced by the

participants. These two social factors were believed having an influence on speakers' linguistic choices (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Speakers have to take into consideration social status and social distance to determine the degree of politeness to use. Studies investigating the role of these elements in the linguistic formulae produced by L2 speakers include the studies of face-threatening speech acts, such as requests and apologies (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Kelly, 2003; Luksaneeyanawin, 2005; Kwai, 2008).

Regarding to the Thai culture, social status and social distance are regarded important (Wongsupap, Chuechart, Jianmat & Suwannatchot, 2008). Thus, these two social variables were included in the present study to investigate whether they played any role in the teachers' utterances when speaking with English native speakers. The results from Pearson's Correlation Coefficient test showed that both social status and social distance were not related to the utterances made by the participants. This finding does not support Wei's (1996) study, which examined the use of linguistic politeness in requests by Chinese learners of English and found that the choice of polite linguistic usage in requests depended greatly on the social distance, and the relative power relation between the speaker and the hearer as stated by Brown & Levinson (1987).

However, the results from the present study were consistent with those of Mei-Chen (1996), who investigated Brown & Levinson's (1987) politeness theory, and found that social status and social distance did not significantly affect her participants' utterance choices. Based on her results, Mei-Chen suggested that this claim should be reconsidered.

Although the findings of this study are in agreement with Mei-Chen's (1996) and Yueng's (1997), the reasons for a lack of relationship between the participants' utterances and the two social contextual factors in Mei-Chen's (1996) study and the present study were different. Mei-Chen found that her Taiwanese participants and Americans employed the same request strategies with the addressees of different social distance, and those strategies were considered appropriate. She, then, suggested that in addition to social factors proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987), other

contextual factors, such as age, gender should be taken into account to measure the appropriateness of linguistic forms. She additionally pointed out that pragmatic norms varied from culture to culture. In contrast to Mei-Chen's finding, this relationship was lacking for the group of Thai English teachers in the present study because of their lack of linguistic ability and pragmatic knowledge.

Although the statistical results showed no relationship between the two social factors and the participants' utterances, the explanations given by the participants in the interview revealed that social status and social distance did influence their production of utterances, but due to their limited English expressions they came across the difficulty. They reported that they could not recall some vocabulary items or even a full sentence. Hence, they only produced utterances that they could remember at that time, though they were not confident that the utterances were appropriate for the given contexts. They further elaborated that they also encountered this problem in their real-life situations. All of them agreed that it might be due to the fact that they lacked sufficient opportunities to use English.

Moreover, a closer look through the participants' utterances made in each situation revealed that they were polite even with a lower-status interlocutor. This is probably because they were influenced by their L1 culture. This finding is also reported by Wannaruk (2005) who found overly-polite expressions from the EFL learners.

## CHAPTER 5

### SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a summary of the research findings, pedagogical implications, and recommendations based on the findings discussed in Chapter four.

#### 5.1 Summary of Research Findings

The present study investigated the pragmatic competence of Thai English teachers in making, accepting, and declining requests. In particular, it was aimed at uncovering the factors that influenced the teachers' pragmatic competence in the three aspects of requesting. It also sought the relationship between the interlocutor's social status and social distance, and the utterances employed by the teachers.

Three sets of instrument (an oral discourse completion test, a questionnaire, and an interview) were employed. Participants consisted of 29 Thai English teachers enrolled in the Master program in Teaching English at a university in Thailand in the 2009 academic year. Data were computed and analyzed to provide answers to three research questions of which the results are summarized below.

5.1.1 The overall pragmatic competence of the Thai English teachers in making, accepting, and declining requests was 36.24 (67%). This figure indicated that the teachers' pragmatic ability in the three aspects of request was at a moderate level. Although they were able to communicate in the given contexts, it was not at a highly successful level. Three unique characteristics were found in the teachers' performance. A lack of satisfactory success in pragmatic competence is described below.

First, the utterances were overly polite in the informal situations; whereas, some were considered rude in the formal situations. This problem was due to the teachers' lack of pragmatic knowledge of the target language, and they might be influenced by their L1. Secondly, the utterances contained improper information. Some contained insufficient information, when they failed to convey the speakers'

real intention: some others were judged as excessive because too much information was provided. The former mistake was because of the teacher's lack of pragmatic knowledge, while the latter was due to their linguistic deficiency. The last characteristic is that the utterances were grammatically incorrect. Some of the utterances contained minor grammatical errors, whereas others contained major ones that can obstruct the speakers' real intention. This linguistic deficiency also led to L1 transfer, where the teachers literally translated an equivalent linguistic expression in Thai to English because they lacked English expressions to utilize in the given situations.

In conclusion, the subjects' pragmatic performances are considered errors. The problems these teachers encountered can be categorized into three major types: (1) a lack of pragmatic knowledge, (2) transfer from L1, and (3) linguistic deficiency. Evidence from this study confirms that both pragmatic competence and linguistic competence are two important factors for successful and effective international communication.

5.1.2 The statistic results also show that the pragmatic competence of the Thai English teachers in the three aspects of requests (making, accepting, and declining requests) is virtually at the same level. Their average scores are 11.21 (64%), 12.52 (69%) and 12.14 (67%), respectively. No significant difference from a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was found. In a closer look into the teachers' utterances, it was found that due to their lack of both pragmatic knowledge and linguistic ability, their abilities to perform the three aspects of requests were similar. Although the responses for accepting requests were considered short and uncomplicated (Allwood, Nivre, and Ahlsen, 1993), they failed to gain high scores.

5.1.3 Results also show three factors playing an important role in the teachers' lack great success in pragmatic competence. They were linguistic competence, English exposure and pragmatic awareness.

The first factor is linguistic competence. Linguistic competence and pragmatic competence of the Thai English teachers in the present study were found not highly related. The teachers with high linguistic proficiency were likely to possess high

pragmatic competence in the three aspects of requests. These results made a contribution to previous studies in that linguistic competence was necessary for pragmatic competence, but it is not sufficient.

The next factor contributing to pragmatic competence is exposure to English. The participants' educational backgrounds, teaching experience, and activities using English in daily life did not statistically correlate to their pragmatic competence. In a closer look into descriptive data of the information mentioned, it was found that this group of English teachers had limited opportunities to use English. This shortage of exposure to genuine English of the Thai English teachers might have caused them to lack both pragmatic competence and linguistic ability, particularly the word choices, evidence from the present study.

Exposure to English referred in the present study was divided into two parts: the quantity of English input and its quality (Bardovi-Harlig, 1996; Jung, 2002). In terms of quantity, it can be concluded that the quantity of English input to which the participants were exposed was not adequate for their pragmatic development. The teachers had a few opportunities to use English. The quality of English input, likewise, may not be enough for the pragmatic acquisition of the teachers.

Pragmatic awareness is the last factor important to pragmatic feature acquisition. The qualitative data showed that the awareness of language use of the teachers was at a high level. The statistical results, however, reported that this high degree of awareness did not lead to a corresponding degree of the teachers' pragmatic competence in the three aspects of requests. Further data analysis indicated that this was due to the teachers' lack of pragmatic ability and linguistic deficiency.

5.1.4 The information given by the Thai English teachers in an oral interview showed that social status and social distance of the interlocutors were influential on the linguistic expressions employed by them. Nonetheless, a test of Pearson correlation coefficient showed the opposite results. No relationship was found between the two mentioned social contextual factors and the teachers' utterances. A qualitative data analysis confirmed that the teachers' deficiency in both pragmatic competence and linguistic ability was the main cause of such phenomenon.

## 5.2 Pedagogical Implications

The present study investigated the pragmatic competence of 29 Thai English teachers. The findings were by no means intended for generalization. The results of the present study, however, may provide some useful information about the scenario of the pragmatic competence of Thai English teachers in the three aspects of requests (making, accepting, and declining requests).

It may also help uncover the factors affecting their pragmatic competence, and the role of social status and social distance in the teachers' utterance production. The following pedagogical implications, thus, are made.

5.2.1 As the pragmatic competence of the Thai English teachers in making, accepting, and declining requests was at a moderate level, it is suggested that the teachers need to receive more extensive and intensive training on pragmatic knowledge in order that their pragmatic competence improves.

5.2.2 The findings also suggested that a potential source of the English teachers' lack great success in pragmatic competence was their linguistic deficiency. Therefore, in addition to pragmatic competence, the linguistic competence of the Thai English teachers must be seriously developed.

5.2.3 The study suggests that the Thai English teachers in the present study and other Thai English teachers should be made aware of the importance of pragmatic competence. As a consequence, they will study this type of knowledge, and include it in their classroom instruction because Thailand is an EFL context in which students have limited opportunities to acquire pragmatic competence on their own.

5.2.4 It was found that a lack of strength in pragmatic competence of the Thai English teachers was due to their lack of exposure to English. This implies that exposure to English is beneficial to pragmatic acquisition. Thus, one way to help EFL learners develop their pragmatic competence is to expose them with English, and to teach them what pragmatics is. By this way, learners' pragmatic awareness is raised, and they may acquire pragmatic knowledge.



Given the information above, it is recommended that English teachers and other concerned parties in English education pay attention to the pragmatic competence of teachers who teach English. This type of knowledge possessed by English teachers should be seriously investigated because it is an important component to help create successful cross-cultural communication (Thomas, 1983; Rose, 1994; Kasper, 1997). If English teachers have a good command of pragmatic competence, they are able to effectively teach their students this type of knowledge. Incorporating the area of pragmatics into English curricula, or organizing a training on pragmatics to Thai English teachers may help develop the teachers' pragmatic competence.

### **5.3 Recommendations for further studies**

The present study investigated the pragmatic competence of Thai English teachers in making, accepting, and declining requests. It was constrained by certain limitations. The following suggestions, made based on the present study, thus, should be considered for future research. First, increasing the number of participating English teachers should be considered since it may help provide a clearer picture of the overall pragmatic competence of these teachers. Secondly, further research should explore the pragmatic competence of other groups of Thai English teachers in other regions of the country, or other types of participants, e.g., EFL students, people who mainly use English in the workplaces, etc. Third, since the current research focused only on the speech act of requests, future research should aim to investigate the pragmatic competence of Thai English teachers in other speech acts, such as apologies and complaints. Fourth, the present study incorporated only social status and social distance to control the participants' linguistic choices of the three aspects of request. Therefore, future research which focuses on the speech act of requests should consider other variables, such as the imposition of act. Fifth, investigating the pragmatic usage of English in the textbooks used in Thai educational institutions, in terms of both quantity and quality would be interesting and beneficial to overall

English education since textbooks are one of vital tools for EFL learners' pragmatic acquisition. Lastly, research using other data collection methods, such as role-play or spontaneous face-to-face interaction should be conducted since these methods may provide more real-life settings for the participants, and thus, more accurate data.

## REFERENCES

- Al-Eryani, A.A. (2007). Refusal Strategies by Yemeni EFL Learners. *Asian EFL Journal*, 9, 19-34.
- Alcon, E. (2005). *Does instruction work for learning pragmatics in the EFL context?*  
Retrieved 25 March 2009, from the World Wide Web:  
<http://www.sciencedirect.com>.
- Allwood, J; Nivre, J& Ahlsen, E. (1993). On the semantics and pragmatics of linguistic feedback. *Journal of Semantics*, 9, 1-30.
- Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bachman, L. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University press.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1996). Pragmatics and language teaching: Bringing pragmatics and pedagogy together. *Pragmatics and language learning, Monograph series*, 7, 21-32.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1999). Exploring the interlanguage of interlanguage pragmatics: A research agenda for acquisitional pragmatics. *Language Learning*, 49, 677-713.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. & Dornyei, Z. (1998). Do language learners recognize pragmatic violations? Pragmatic versus grammatical awareness in instructed L2 learning. *Tesol Quarterly*, 32, 42-71.
- BBC (2010). *How to request and offer*. Retrieved February 2010, from the World Wide Web:  
[http://www.bbc.co.uk/worldservice/learningenglish/radio/specials/142\\_requests\\_offers.html](http://www.bbc.co.uk/worldservice/learningenglish/radio/specials/142_requests_offers.html).
- Blum-Kulka, S. & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns. *Applied Linguistics*, 5, 196-213.
- Blum-Kulka, S. & Olshtain, E (1986). Too many words: Length of utterance and pragmatic failure. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 8, 165-179.

- Bouton, L.F. (1992). The interpretation of implicature in English by NNS: Does it come automatically—without being explicitly taught? *Pragmatics and Language Learning, Monograph series, 3*, 53-65.
- Bowen, C. (2001). *Semantic and pragmatic difficulties and semantic pragmatic language order*. Retrieved February 2010, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.speech-language-therapy.com/spld.htm>.
- Brown, P. & Leveinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*, 1-47.
- Cedar, P.S. (2005). Thai and American responses to English compliments: Evidence for teaching language and culture. *ThaiTESOL Bulletin, 8*, 70-79.
- Chang, Y. (2009). How to say no: an analysis of cross-cultural difference and pragmatic transfer. *Language Sciences, 31*, 477-493.
- Chierchia, G. & McConnell-Ginet, S. (1990). *Meaning and grammar: An introduction to semantics*. Cambridge: MIT press.
- Cohen, A.D. (1994). *Assessing language ability in the classroom*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Cohen, A.D. (1996). Speech Acts. In McKay, S.L., & Hornberger, N.H. (Eds.). *Sociolinguistics and language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cruse, A. (2000). *Meaning in language: An introduction to semantics and pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dong, H. (2006). *Survey of high school English teachers' pragmatic failure*. Retrieved February 2009, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.linguist.org.cn/doc/su200605/su20060514.pdf>.
- Edwards, M. & Csizer, K. (2004). Developing pragmatic competence in the EFL classroom. *Forum, 42*, 16-21.

- Eslami-Rasekh, Z. (2004). *The effect of explicit metapragmatic instruction on the speech act awareness of advanced EFL students*. Retrieved December 2008, from the World Wide Web: <http://tesl-ej.org/ej30/a2.html>.
- Eslami-Rasekh, Z. (2005). Raising the pragmatic awareness of language learners. *ELT Journal*, 5, 199-208.
- Gajaseni, C. (1994). *A contrastive study of compliment responses in American English and Thai including the effect of gender and social status*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Grant, L. & Starks, D. (2001). Screening appropriate teaching materials: Closings from textbooks and television soap operas. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 39, 39-50.
- Grossi, V. (2009). Teaching pragmatic competence: Compliments and compliment responses in the ESL classroom. *Prospect Journal*, 24, 53-62.
- Guerray, A.F. & Flor, A.M. (2003). *Requests in films and in EFL textbooks: A comparison*. Retrieved March 2009, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.institutional.us.es/revistas/elia/pdf/4>.
- Heidi, V. (2004). *Learning pragmatics from ESL & EFL textbooks: How likely?* Retrieved November 2009, from the World Wide Web: <http://tesl-ej.org/ej30/a3.html>.
- Hoffman-Hicks, S. (1992). Linguistic and pragmatic competence: Their relationship in the overall competence of the language learner. *Pragmatics and Language Learning, Monograph series*, 3, 66-80.
- Hornby, A.S. (1995). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- House, J. (1996). Developing pragmatic fluency in English as a foreign language. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18, 225-252.
- Hymes, D.H. (1971). *On communicative competence*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. Extracts available in Brumfit, C.J. & Johnson, K. (Eds.) (1979). *The communicative approach to language teaching*, pp. 5-26. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Iwasaki, N. (2008). *L2 Japanese acquisition of the pragmatics of requests during a short-term study abroad*. Retrieved May 2009, from the World Wide Web: [https://eprints.soas.ac.uk/6443/1/Iwasaki\\_Euro\\_Sympo\\_2008.pdf](https://eprints.soas.ac.uk/6443/1/Iwasaki_Euro_Sympo_2008.pdf).
- Jalilifar, A. (2009). Request strategies: Cross-sectional study of Iranian EFL learners and Australian native speakers. *English Language Teaching*, 2, 46-61.
- Jenkins, J. (2003). *World Englishes: A resource book for students*. London: Routledge.
- Jung, J.Y. (2002). *Issues in Acquisitional Pragmatics*. Retrieved April 2009, from the World Wide Web: <http://journals.tc-library.org/ojs/index.php/tesol/article/viewfile/21/26>.
- Junthawithed, P. (2002). *Offering and requesting*. Retrieved May 2010, from the World Wide Web: <http://vocelt.vec.go.th>.
- Kasper, G. (1997). *Can pragmatic competence be taught?* Retrieved November 2008, from the World Wide Web: <http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/Networks/NW06/>.
- Kasper, G. & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). *Interlanguage pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kasper, G. & Rose, K.R. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language*. MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Kelly, E.C. (2003). *Pragmatic competence and failure in the Japanese university EFL classroom*. Retrieved December, 2008, from the World Wide Web: <http://cicero.u-bunkyo.ac.jp/lib/kiyo/fsell2003/17-30.pdf>.
- Kondo, S. (2002). *Raising pragmatic awareness in the EFL context*. Retrieved December 2008, from the World Wide Web: <http://jrc.sophia.ac.jp/kiyou/ki24/kondo.pdf>.
- Kwai, P.S. (2008). *Exploring the pragmatic competence of EFL learners in the production and judgement of formal written requests*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Macquarie University.
- Levinson, S.C. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Li, R. (2007). The relationship between linguistic proficiency and pragmatic ability. *US-China Foreign Language*, 5, 13-17.

- Liao, C. & Bresnahan, M.I. (1996). A contrastive pragmatic study on American English and Mandarin refusal strategies. *Language Sciences*, 18, 703-727.
- Liu, J. (2006). Assessing EFL learners' interlanguage pragmatic knowledge: implications for testers and teachers. *Reflections on English language teaching*, 5, 1-22
- Luksaneeyanawin, S. (2005). *Pragmatic transfer and refusal strategies in Thai English*. Retrieved June 2009, from the World Wide Web:  
[http://www.waseda.jp/ocw/AsianStudies/9A-77WorldEnglishSpring2005/Assignments/00\\_Thai\\_/ThaiE\\_4.pdf](http://www.waseda.jp/ocw/AsianStudies/9A-77WorldEnglishSpring2005/Assignments/00_Thai_/ThaiE_4.pdf).
- Luksaneeyanawin, S. (2005). *Structures and strategies of request in Thai English*. Retrieved June 2009, from the World Wide Web:  
[http://www.waseda.jp/ocw/AsianStudies/9A-77WorldEnglishSpring2005/Assignments/00\\_Thai\\_/ThaiE\\_4.pdf](http://www.waseda.jp/ocw/AsianStudies/9A-77WorldEnglishSpring2005/Assignments/00_Thai_/ThaiE_4.pdf).
- McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language: Rethinking goals and approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University press.
- McLean, T. (2004). Giving students a fighting chance: Pragmatics in the language classroom. *TESL Canada Journal*, 21, 72-92.
- McMillan, J.H.C & Schumacher, S. (1997). *Research in education: A conceptual in production*. New York: Addison-Wesley Educational Publisher Inc.
- Mei-Chen, H. (1996). *Achieving cross-cultural equivalence in a study of American and Taiwanese requests*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Mei-Xiao, L. (2008). *Pragmatic failure in intercultural communication and English teaching in China*. Retrieved February 2009, from the World Wide Web:  
<http://www.chinamediaresearch.net/vol4no3/06Mei-xiao%20Lin-final.pdf>.
- Nguyen, M. T. T. (2008). Criticizing in an L2: Pragmatic strategies used by Vietnamese EFL learners. *Intercultural Pragmatics*. 5, 41-66.
- Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A.D. (1990). The learning of complex speech act behavior. *TESL Canada Journal*, 7, 45-65.

- Perriman, I. (1999). *Giving refusals in Saudi Arabic with reference to American English*. Retrieved March 2010, from the World Wide Web: <http://faculty.ksu.edu.sa>.
- Prachanant, N. (2006). *Pragmatic transfer in responses to complaints by Thai EFL learners in the hotel business*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Suranaree University of Technology.
- Richards, J.C., Platt, J., & Platt H. (1992). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). England: Pearson Education.
- Rose, K.R. (1994). Pragmatic consciousness-raising in an EFL context. *Pragmatics and Language Learning, Monograph series*, 5, 52-62.
- Rose, K.R. (1997). Pragmatics in the classroom: Theoretical concerns and practical possibilities. *Pragmatics and Language Learning, Monograph series*, 8, 267-295.
- Safont Jorda, M.P. (2004). *An analysis on EAP learners' pragmatic production: A focus on request form*. Retrieved December 2008, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.aelfe.org/documents/03-RA-8-Safont.pdf>.
- Sasaki, T. & Beamer, M.S. (2002). *Pragmatic transfer and length of residence in a target language*. Retrieved November 2009, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.jalt-publications.org/archive/proceedings/2002/379.pdf>.
- Searle, J.R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, L. E., (1988). The role of English in Thailand: Transition and traditions. *ELT Newsletter*, 4, 21-26.
- Som-in, P. (1988). *Enhancing risk-taking in speaking to increase students' participation in the classroom*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, King Mongkut's Institute of Technology.
- Suh, E. (2009). Metapragmatic requesting instruction in an adult basic education-ESL classroom. *MinneWITESOL Journal*, 6, 1-16.
- Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 91-112.



- Urano, K. (2000). Negative pragmatic transfer in compliment responses by Japanese learners of English: A research proposal. *Shinshu University Research on Communication and Language Education*, 2, 27-38.
- Wannaruk, A. (2005). *Pragmatic transfer in Thai EFL refusals*. Retrieved February 2009, from the World Wide Web: <http://rel.sagepub.com>.
- Wei, H. (1996). An empirical study of Chinese request strategies. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 122, 127-138.
- Wolfson, N. (1989). Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL. *Applied Linguistics*, 6, 71-90.
- Wongsupap, R., Chuechart, S., Jianmart, A, & Suwannatchot, R. (2008). *Man and society*. Songkhla: Prince of Songkla University.
- Xiao, Z. & Guangyi, W. (2005). *An exploration into pragmatic failure in EFL learning*. Retrieved February 2009, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.linguist.org.cn/doc/su200507/su20050715.pdf>.
- Yang, X. (2008). A cross-sectional study of Chinese learners acquisition of English request. *CELEA Journal*, 31, 31-43.
- Yeung, L. N. T. (1997). Polite requests in English and Chinese business correspondence in Hong Kong. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 27, 505-522.

## APPENDIXES

## APPENDIX A

### Pragmatic Completion Test (English Version)

**Your role:** You are studying in the United States. You stay with your elder brother who already got married with an American woman named Mary. They have two children. The elder is a girl named Emmy and the younger is a boy named Tom. Your sister-in-law and her kids cannot speak Thai at all. During your study, you work part-time at a private company. You have one immediate boss. You are familiar with and know him very well. However, you are not close with your big boss who is a company manager and the rest of the staff.

1. You are going to college, but you forget your book in the living room. You ask Mary, your sister-in-law, to get the book for you. What would you say?
2. A strange girl asks you to buy a seafood coupon, but you are a vegetarian. What would you say to refuse her?
3. Julia, your close friend wants to go to your house this Sunday. You are free and want her to go. What would you say?
4. Today you need to take a half-day leave to go to your friend's wedding party. What would you say to your big boss?
5. Some children who are playing football have dropped their ball into a pond, so they ask you to help get the ball from the pond. You are glad to help. What would you say?
6. You were absent from class yesterday. You want to borrow lecture notes from your classmate with whom you are not familiar. What would you say to her?
7. You are having dinner with your foreign close friend. What would you say to get your friend to pass you the sugar?
8. Your foreign teacher, whom you assist and know very well, asks you to type a document. You are glad to help. What would you say?
9. Tom, your nephew, asks you to play game with him. You are not free. What would you say to refuse him?

10. A friend who played tennis with you last year, and has never met you since then has lost her racquet. She would like to borrow yours. You want to lend her your racquet. What would you say?
11. You are having dinner at a restaurant. You want some more water. What would you say to a waiter?
12. One customer of your company asks you for the time. You don't have a watch. What would you say?
13. A foreign student, whom you used to take care of during a science camp, but have not spoken to since then, asks you to write a reference for him to join an English camp. You are glad to do it. What would you say?
14. Your boss asks you to make a copy, but you are going to an important meeting. What would you say to decline his request?
15. Your previous teacher, to whom you have not spoken since you finished her course, asks you to help carry a pile of the books to her office. You are glad to help. What would you say?
16. Emmy, your niece is listening to music. The music is very loud and is disturbing you. What would you say to Emmy to get her to turn down the volume?
17. Your colleague, with whom you are not familiar, asks you to work during her absence. You are not free. How do you decline?
18. You are walking in the park. A strange woman asks you to help move her motorcycle to the nearest gas station because it is out of gas. You want to help her. What would you say?
19. At work, you want a subordinate to copy a document for you. What would you say?
20. Your classmate, who has just begun studying in your college today, asks you to tutor her in biology, but you are in a hurry to get to work. What would you say to decline her request?
21. Your immediate boss, who you know very well, asks you to drop by a service counter to pay the water supply fee. You are in hurry to get to your college. What would you say to refuse him?
22. You are filling out a scholarship form, but your pen is broken. You think to borrow a pen from a nearby student from a different faculty. What would you say?

23. A new teacher who has just moved to teach at your college asks you to take him to the library. You are glad to do it. What would you say?
24. Daniel, your close friend asks if anyone minds his smoking. You are allergic to smoke. What would you say to refuse him?
25. Emmy asks you to help her with her homework. You are free and want to help. What would you say?
26. You are wandering around the city, and you are lost. You see a man, whom you recognize that he is a department head at your company, so you think you will ask him for the directions. What would you say?
27. Your friend's sister, who you have known for a long time but rarely talk with, would like to borrow your cartoon book. You already gave that book to someone. What would you say to her?

## APPENDIX A

### แบบทดสอบความสามารถทางวินิจปฏิบัติศาสตร์ (Thai Version)

สมมุติว่าคุณกำลังศึกษาที่ประเทศสหรัฐอเมริกา และพักอาศัยอยู่กับครอบครัวของพี่ชาย พี่ชายของคุณแต่งงานกับผู้หญิงอเมริกันชื่อว่าแมรี และมีลูกด้วยกันสองคน คนโตเป็นผู้หญิงชื่อเอมมี คนเล็กเป็นผู้ชายชื่อทอม พี่สะใภ้และลูกๆ ไม่สามารถพูดภาษาไทยได้เลย ระหว่างการศึกษา คุณทำงานในตำแหน่งพนักงานจัดเอกสารที่บริษัทแห่งหนึ่ง คุณมีความสนิทสนมกับหัวหน้าแผนกเป็นอย่างดี แต่ไม่สนิทกับผู้จัดการบริษัท และพนักงานในแผนกอื่นๆ

1. คุณกำลังจะออกจากบ้านเพื่อไปเรียน แต่คุณลืมหนังสือไว้ในห้องนั่งเล่น คุณจึงขอร้องให้แมรี ซึ่งเป็นพี่สะใภ้ของคุณช่วยหยิบหนังสือให้ คุณจะพูดว่าอย่างไร
2. เด็กสาวคนหนึ่งเข้ามาขอร้องให้คุณช่วยซื้ออุปกรณ์อาหารทะเล แต่คุณเป็นมังสวิรัต্ত์ คุณจะปฏิเสธอย่างไร
3. จูเลีย เพื่อนสนิทขอไปเที่ยวที่บ้านคุณในวันอาทิตย์นี้ คุณว่างจึงตอบตกลง คุณจะพูดกับจูเลียว่าอย่างไร
4. วันนี้คุณต้องไปงานแต่งงานของเพื่อน คุณต้องการลาหยุดครึ่งวัน คุณจะพูดกับผู้จัดการบริษัทว่าอย่างไรเพื่อขอลาหยุด
5. เด็กๆ ที่เล่นฟุตบอลทำลูกบอลตกลงไปในสระ พวกเขาจึงขอร้องให้คุณช่วยเก็บให้ คุณจะยินดีช่วย คุณจะพูดว่าอย่างไร
6. เมื่อวานคุณไม่ได้มาเข้าเรียน คุณต้องการขอเอกสารประกอบการเรียนจากเพื่อนร่วมห้อง ซึ่งคุณไม่สนิทเท่าไร คุณจะพูดว่าอย่างไร
7. คุณกำลังกินข้าวอยู่กับเพื่อนสนิทซึ่งเป็นชาวต่างชาติ คุณต้องการน้ำตาลซึ่งวางอยู่ใกล้เพื่อนของคุณ คุณจะพูดว่าอย่างไรเพื่อให้เพื่อนส่งน้ำตาลให้
8. อาจารย์ชาวต่างชาติซึ่งคุณช่วยงานอยู่ และคุณสนิทสนมเป็นอย่างดี ขอให้คุณพิมพ์เอกสารให้ คุณจะยินดีช่วย คุณจะตอบอาจารย์ว่าอย่างไร
9. ทอม หลานชายของคุณขอให้คุณเล่นเกมด้วย แต่คุณไม่ว่าง คุณจะปฏิเสธอย่างไร

10. คุณเคยเรียนเทนนิสกับเพื่อนคนหนึ่งเมื่อปีที่แล้ว และหลังจากเรียนจบคุณกับเขาไม่ได้เจอกันอีกเลย เพื่อนคนนี้ทำไม้เทนนิสหาย เธอจึงขอยืม ไม้เทนนิสของคุณ คุณคิดว่าจะให้เธอ ยืม คุณจะตอบเธออย่างไร
11. คุณทานข้าวอยู่ที่ร้านอาหารแห่งหนึ่ง น้ำดื่มของคุณหมด คุณจึงขอร้องให้พนักงานเสิร์ฟ เติมน้ำให้ คุณจะพูดว่าอย่างไร
12. ลูกค้าของบริษัทที่คุณทำงานอยู่เข้ามาถามเวลาจากคุณ คุณไม่มีนาฬิกา คุณจะตอบอย่างไร
13. เด็กต่างชาติคนหนึ่งซึ่งคุณเคยดูแลตอนเข้าค่ายวิทยาศาสตร์ขอให้คุณเขียนจดหมายรับรอง เพื่อไปเข้าค่ายภาษาอังกฤษ คุณยินดีจะเขียนให้ คุณจะพูดว่าอย่างไร
14. ผู้จัดการบริษัทขอให้คุณช่วยถ่ายเอกสารให้ แต่คุณกำลังรีบไปประชุม คุณจะปฏิเสธ อย่างไร
15. อาจารย์ที่คุณเคยเรียนด้วยเมื่อเทอมที่แล้ว แต่คุณไม่เคยเจอกับอาจารย์อีกเลยหลังจากเรียน จบ ขอร้องให้คุณช่วยยกหนังสือไปที่ห้องทำงาน คุณจะตอบอย่างไรว่าคุณยินดีช่วย
16. คุณกำลังเขียนรายงานอยู่ เอมมีหลานของคุณเปิดวิทยุเสียงดังรบกวนสมาธิ คุณจะพูดว่า อย่างไรเพื่อให้เอมมีเบาเสียงวิทยุ
17. เพื่อนร่วมงานซึ่งคุณไม่ค่อยสนิทขอให้คุณทำงานแทนเธอ เพราะเธอติดธุระสำคัญ แต่คุณก็ ไม่ว่าง คุณจะปฏิเสธอย่างไร
18. คุณกำลังเดินเล่นอยู่ที่สวนสาธารณะ หญิงสาวคนหนึ่งซึ่งคุณไม่รู้จัก ขอให้คุณช่วยเงิน รถจักรยานยนต์ซึ่งน้ำมันหมดไปที่ปั้มน้ำมันใกล้ๆ คุณยินดีช่วย คุณจะพูดว่าอย่างไร
19. คุณต้องการให้พนักงานที่ทำงานในบริษัทเดียวกันกับคุณ แต่อยู่ในตำแหน่งที่ต่ำกว่าคุณถ่าย เอกสารให้ คุณจะพูดว่าอย่างไร
20. เพื่อนร่วมชั้นเรียนที่เพิ่งย้ายเข้ามาเรียนวันนี้เป็นวันแรกขอร้องให้คุณช่วยติวหนังสือ แต่คุณ กำลังรีบไปทำงาน คุณจะปฏิเสธอย่างไร
21. หัวหน้าแผนกของคุณ ซึ่งคุณสนิทสนมเป็นอย่างดี ขอให้คุณแวะจ่ายค่าไฟที่จุดบริการ แต่ คุณต้องรีบไปเรียน คุณจะปฏิเสธอย่างไร
22. คุณกำลังกรอกเอกสารเพื่อขอทุนการศึกษาอยู่ แต่ปากกาของคุณน้ำหมึกหมด คุณจึงคิดจะ ขอยืมปากกาจากเพื่อนต่างคณะซึ่งคุณไม่รู้จักเลย คุณจะพูดว่าอย่างไร

23. อาจารย์ใหม่ที่เพิ่งย้ายมาขอร้องให้คุณช่วยพาไปที่ห้องสมุด คุณยินดีจะพาอาจารย์ไป คุณจะพูดว่าอย่างไร
24. แคนเนี่ยล เพื่อนสนิทของคุณขอสูบบุหรี่ในรถ แต่คุณแพ้บุหรี่ คุณจะพูดอย่างไรเพื่อตอบปฏิเสธ
25. เอมมีหลานของคุณขอให้คุณช่วยสอนการบ้านให้ คุณว่างจึงตอบตกลง คุณจะพูดกับเธอว่าอย่างไร
26. คุณกำลังเดินเที่ยวอยู่ และคุณคิดว่าคุณหลงทาง คุณเห็นผู้ชายคนหนึ่งซึ่งคุณจำได้ว่าเป็นหัวหน้าแผนกหนึ่งในบริษัทที่คุณทำงานอยู่ แต่คุณไม่เคยคุยกับเขา คุณคิดจะถามทางจากเขา คุณจะพูดว่าอย่างไร
27. น้องสาวของเพื่อนซึ่งคุณรู้จักมานานแล้ว แต่เคยพูดคุยด้วยไม่กี่ครั้งขอยืมหนังสือการ์ตูนของคุณ แต่คุณให้หนังสือเล่มนี้กับคนอื่นไปแล้ว คุณจะปฏิเสธอย่างไร



## APPENDIX B

### Appropriate Answers for the Oral Discourse Completion Test (Version 1)

1. Mary, could you please bring me my book from the living room?
2. I'm sorry, but I am a vegetarian.
3. I would be happy to have you come see me on Sunday, Julia.
4. Boss, may I have a half day off today so I can go to my friend's wedding party?
5. Certainly, I will get it for you.
6. Excuse me. May I borrow your lecture notes from yesterday?
7. Would you pass the sugar please?
8. Certainly, I would be happy to help you.
9. I'm sorry. I'm not free to play right now.
10. Certainly, no problem.
11. Excuse me, could I have some more water please?
12. I'm sorry I'm not wearing a watch.
13. Certainly, I would be happy to do it for you.
14. I'm sorry, I can't. I'm on my way to a meeting.
15. Certainly, I would be happy to do it for you.
16. Excuse me Emmy, could you turn down the radio please?
17. I'm sorry. I'm not free.
18. Certainly. I would be happy to help you.
19. Excuse me, could you make a copy of this for me, please?
20. I'm sorry. I can't right now because I am on my way to work.
21. I'm sorry, but I can't now. I am on my way to college.
22. Excuse me, could I borrow your pen please?
23. Certainly, I would be happy to show you the way.
24. I'm sorry, but I am allergic to cigarette smoke.
25. Certainly, I would be happy to help you.
26. Excuse me, could you tell me the way to the \_\_\_\_\_?
27. I'm sorry, but I already lent it to someone else.

**Appropriate Answers for the Oral Discourse Completion Test (Version 2)**

1. Mary, I've forgotten my book could you get it for me. It's in the living room.
2. I'm sorry but I can't do that because I'm a vegetarian. Would you mind asking someone else?
3. That's great! What time will you come?
4. Excuse me sir, do you have a moment? I wonder if it would be all right if I took a half day's leave today. My friend is getting married today, and I'd like to go to her wedding party.
5. Sure; no problem.
6. Hi! You're in my class aren't you? Look, I wasn't at the class yesterday. Do you think I could borrow your lecture notes?
7. Pass me the sugar, would you?
8. Sure, I'd be happy to do that for you.
9. I'm Sorry Tom, I can't. I'm busy right now. Maybe later huh?
10. Sure; no problem.
11. Could I have some more water please?
12. I'm sorry I don't have a watch.
13. Sure, no problem.
14. I'm sorry sir, I'm just on my way to a meeting. Would you mind asking someone else?
15. Sure, no problem.
16. Emmy, that music is very loud! Could you turn a down a bit?
17. I'm really sorry but I'm busy that day. Maybe you could ask someone else.
18. Sure, no problem.
19. (name), could you take a copy of this for me?
20. I'm sorry I can't help you right now because I'm on my way to work. Maybe some other time.
21. Sorry, (name). I have to get to college right now and I'm already late. Can it wait until tomorrow?
22. Excuse me. Would you mind if I borrowed your pen for a few moments? Mine isn't working.

23. Sure, No problem. Just follow me.
24. Sorry Daniel I have an allergy to smoke. You'll have to smoke outside.
25. Sure Emmy! I'd love to.
26. Excuse me sir, I think you work at (name of company). You probably don't recognize me but I work in (name of department). I'm completely lost! Do you think you could tell me how to get to (place)?
27. I'm sorry but I've already given that book to (name). Maybe you could ask her if you can borrow it.

### **Appropriate Answers for the Oral Discourse Completion Test (Version 3)**

1. Excuse me, could bring me my text book from the living room table please?  
I forgot it and need it for class.
2. I'm sorry, I'm vegetarian.
3. Yeah sure, I'd love you to come. Would you like to do anything special?
4. Excuse me sir. I'm sorry to ask for leave, but my friend is getting married.  
Would it be possible to take half a day leave next week?
5. No problem.
6. I'm sorry. Could I borrow your lecture notes from yesterday's class as  
I was absent?
7. Pass me the sugar, please.
8. Sure. I'd be glad to.
9. Sorry. I don't have time.
10. Sure. Help yourself.
11. Excuse me. Could I have some more water please?
12. I'm sorry, I don't have a watch.
13. I'd love to help you.
14. Could I do it later? I have to go to a meeting.
15. Of course, I can.
16. Hey! Emmy. Turn it down. I have to do my work.
17. I'm very sorry, but I'm busy.
18. Of course. I can help you.

19. Could you copy this for me, please?
20. I'm really sorry. I can't help you just now. How about later?
21. I'm sorry. I have to go to college, and I'm running late. Could I do it on my way home?
22. Sorry. Can I borrow your pen, please? Mine is broken.
23. Of course, I can. Follow me.
24. Yes I do. I have an allergy to smoke. How about you step outside to smoke?
25. How can I help you?
26. Sorry Sir. Can you help me, please? I am lost.
27. Sorry. I don't have it any more. I already gave it to someone else.

#### **Appropriate Answers for the Oral Discourse Completion Test (Version 4)**

1. Mary, I forgot my book in the living room. Please bring it to me.
2. Sorry. I'm vegetarian.
3. Sure. See you Sunday.
4. Boss, could I take a half-day leave? I'm going to my friend's wedding party.
5. Okay, guys. I'll get the ball for you.
6. May I please borrow yesterday's lecture?
7. Please pass the sugar.
8. I'm happy to do that.
9. Sorry, Tom. I'm busy. Later, ok?
10. Sure.
11. May I have some water, please?
12. Sorry. I don't have a watch.
13. I'm happy to give you a reference.
14. Sorry, boss. I have an important meeting now.
15. Sure, my pleasure.
16. Emmy, please turn down the music.
17. Sorry. I'm really busy.

18. Sure. No problem.
19. Could you please copy this for me?
20. Sorry. I can't right now. I have to get to work. Later, perhaps.
21. Sorry. I can't. I have to get to class now.
22. Excuse me. May I borrow your pen?
23. Sure. Follow me, please.
24. I'd appreciate if you don't. I'm allergic to smoke.
25. Okay. Show me your homework.
26. Hi! You work at \_\_\_\_\_. I'm lost. Can you give me directions to \_\_\_\_\_?
27. Sorry. A friend borrowed it. I'll let you know when she returns it.

## APPENDIX C

### Questionnaire (English Version)

Please tick / in the box  you want and give details where required.

#### Part 1 Personal information and Educational background

1. Sex:  Male       Female

2. Age \_\_\_\_\_ years old

3. Educational Level

Bachelor's degree, major \_\_\_\_\_ Institution \_\_\_\_\_

Diploma, major \_\_\_\_\_ Institution \_\_\_\_\_

Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

4. At what educational level did you begin to study English?

Kindergarten     Primary 1     Primary 5     Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

5. Have you ever studied English with an English native teacher?

Yes                       No                      (If no, please go to item# 8)

6. If you studied English with an English native teacher, at what educational level were you? (You are allowed to choose more than 1 item.)

Primary                       Lower secondary                       Upper secondary

Vocational                       University                       Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

7. What is the type of the school?

Bilingual                       International                       Government

Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

8. Have you ever lived in an English-speaking country?

Yes                       No                      (If no, please go to item# 12)

9. What is the purpose to live in the country, and how long did you stay there?

(You are allowed to answer more than 1 item.)

- Study \_\_\_\_\_ days \_\_\_\_\_ weeks \_\_\_\_\_ months \_\_\_\_\_ years
- Seminar \_\_\_\_\_ days \_\_\_\_\_ weeks \_\_\_\_\_ months \_\_\_\_\_ years
- Travel \_\_\_\_\_ days \_\_\_\_\_ weeks \_\_\_\_\_ months \_\_\_\_\_ years
- Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_ days \_\_\_\_\_ weeks \_\_\_\_\_ months \_\_\_\_\_ years

10. During living in the English-speaking country, whom did you stay with?

- Thai family       English Native speakers       International hostel

11. During living in the English-speaking country, what was your purpose in using English? (You are allowed to answer more than 1 items)

- Greeting
- everyday    \_\_ times/week    \_\_ times/month    Other (please specify) \_\_
- Talking about work issues
- everyday    \_\_ times/week    \_\_ times/month    Other (please specify) \_\_
- Talking about personal issues
- everyday    \_\_ times/week    \_\_ times/month    Other (please specify) \_\_
- Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- everyday    \_\_ times/week    \_\_ times/month    Other (please specify) \_\_

## Part 2 Teaching Experience

12. How long have you taught English?

- 1 month-5year    6-10 years    11-15 years    16-20 years    21 years up

13. At present, at what educational level do you teach? (You are allowed to answer more than 1 item.)

- Primary                       Lower secondary                       Upper secondary  
 Vocational                       University                       Other (please specify)\_\_\_\_\_

14. What English skill do you teach? (You are allowed to answer more than 1 item.)

- Listening    Speaking    Reading    Writing    4 skills

15. Can your English teaching help improve your English use?

- Yes                       No      (If no, please go to item# 17.)

16. If it helps, in what way does it help? (Please select only 1 item which is the most correct for your situation.)

- Your English teaching allowed you to use English well for day-to-day activities.
- Your English teaching helped you use English more fluently.
- Your English teaching helped you to use English more grammatically-correct and more appropriately, e.g. condolence.
- Your English teaching helped you to use English more fluent, more grammatically-correct, and more appropriately, e.g. condolence.
- Other (Please specify)\_\_\_\_\_

17. Is there an English native teacher in the school you work?

- Yes                       No      (If no, please go to item# 20)

18. At work, do you have a chance to use English with a native speaker?

- Yes                       No                      (If no, please go to item# 20)



19. What is your purpose to use English with that native speaker? (You are allowed to answer more than 1 item.)

- Greeting  
 everyday  \_\_ times/week  \_\_ times/month  Other (please specify)\_\_\_
- Talking about work issues  
 everyday  \_\_ times/week  \_\_ times/month  Other (please specify)\_\_\_
- Talking about personal issues  
 everyday  \_\_ times/week  \_\_ times/month  Other (please specify)\_\_\_
- Other (please specify \_\_\_\_\_)  
 everyday  \_\_ times/week  \_\_ times/month  Other (please specify)\_\_\_

### Part 3 Activities Using English

20. Do you have a chance to use English in daily life?

- Yes  No (If no, please go to item# 22)

21. If yes, what is the purpose to use English, and how often do you use it? (You are allowed to answer more than 1 item.)

- Face-to-face talk with a foreigner  
 everyday  \_\_ times/week  \_\_ times/month  Other (please specify)\_\_\_
- Chat on line  
 everyday  \_\_ times/week  \_\_ times/month  Other (please specify)\_\_\_
- E-mail  
 everyday  \_\_ times/week  \_\_ times/month  Other (please specify)\_\_\_
- Talking on the telephone  
 everyday  \_\_ times/week  \_\_ times/month  Other (please specify)\_\_\_
- Watching English movies or series  
 everyday  \_\_ times/week  \_\_ times/month  Other (please specify)\_\_\_

Watching talk shows or varieties in English

everyday  \_\_ times/week  \_\_ times/month  Other (please specify) \_\_

Reading English novels or cartoon books

everyday  \_\_ times/week  \_\_ times/month  Other (please specify) \_\_

Reading English magazines or newspaper

everyday  \_\_ times/week  \_\_ times/month  Other (please specify) \_\_

Reading conversation books

everyday  \_\_ times/week  \_\_ times/month  Other (please specify) \_\_

Study English with language institutions, e.g. AUA

everyday  \_\_ times/week  \_\_ times/month  Other (please specify) \_\_

Searching for information in English on the Internet

everyday  \_\_ times/week  \_\_ times/month  Other (please specify) \_\_

Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

everyday  \_\_ times/week  \_\_ times/month  Other (please specify) \_\_

### Part 4 Awareness in learning and using English

Item 22 – 30 Please mark / in the box you want to indicate the level of importance.

1 = The least    2 = Little    3 = Moderate    4 = Much    5 = The most

	1	2	3	4	5
22. You think that if you are able to use English, you should use it accurately and appropriately.					
23. You study the culture of the target language.					
24. An interlocutor influences your utterance.					
25. You try to use English whenever you can.					
26. You notice your mistakes when using English and improve them next time.					
27. When you learn new English expressions, you write them down.					
28. You search for the meanings of the new expressions you learn and study how and when to use them.					
29. You try to speak those new expressions with your friends.					
30. You look for similarities and differences between Thai expressions and English.					

**\*\*\*\*\* Thank You \*\*\*\*\***

## APPENDIX C

### แบบสอบถาม (Thai Version)

กรุณาทำเครื่องหมาย / ในช่อง  ที่คุณต้องการเลือก และเขียนอธิบายในข้อที่ต้องการคำตอบ

#### ส่วนที่ 1 ข้อมูลส่วนตัว และประวัติการศึกษา

1. เพศ:  ชาย  หญิง

2. อายุ \_\_\_\_\_ ปี

3. ประวัติการศึกษา

ปริญญาตรี สาขา \_\_\_\_\_ สถาบัน \_\_\_\_\_

อนุปริญญา สาขา \_\_\_\_\_ สถาบัน \_\_\_\_\_

อื่น ๆ (ระบุ) \_\_\_\_\_

4. เริ่มเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ

อนุบาล  ประถมศึกษา 1  ประถมศึกษา 5  อื่นๆ (ระบุ) \_\_\_\_\_

5. คุณเคยเรียนกับอาจารย์ชาวต่างชาติที่เป็นเจ้าของภาษาอังกฤษหรือไม่

เคย  ไม่เคย (หากไม่เคย ข้ามไปตอบข้อ 8)

6. ถ้าเคย คุณเรียนที่สถาบันแห่งนั้นในระดับชั้นใด (สามารถตอบได้มากกว่า 1 ข้อ)

ประถมศึกษา  มัธยมศึกษาตอนต้น  มัธยมศึกษาตอนปลาย

ปวช. - ปวส.  อุดมศึกษา  อื่นๆ (ระบุ) \_\_\_\_\_

7. สถาบันเป็นสถานศึกษาประเภทใด

สองภาษา (Bilingual)  นานาชาติ  สามัญ

อื่นๆ (ระบุ) \_\_\_\_\_

8. คุณเคยอาศัยอยู่ในประเทศที่ใช้ภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาหลักหรือไม่

- เคย                       ไม่เคย                      (หากไม่เคย ข้ามไปตอบข้อ 12)

9. คุณอาศัยอยู่ในประเทศนั้นๆ เพื่อจุดประสงค์ใด และอาศัยอยู่นานเท่าไร? (สามารถตอบได้มากกว่า 1 ข้อ)

- ศึกษาต่อ                      เป็นระยะเวลา \_\_\_\_ วัน \_\_\_\_ สัปดาห์ \_\_\_\_ เดือน \_\_\_\_ ปี
- สัมมนา / ดูงาน                      เป็นระยะเวลา \_\_\_\_ วัน \_\_\_\_ สัปดาห์ \_\_\_\_ เดือน \_\_\_\_ ปี
- ท่องเที่ยว                      เป็นระยะเวลา \_\_\_\_ วัน \_\_\_\_ สัปดาห์ \_\_\_\_ เดือน \_\_\_\_ ปี
- อื่นๆ (ระบุ) \_\_\_\_\_ เป็นระยะเวลา \_\_\_\_ วัน \_\_\_\_ สัปดาห์ \_\_\_\_ เดือน \_\_\_\_ ปี

10. ระหว่างที่อยู่ในประเทศนั้นๆ คุณอาศัยอยู่กับใคร

- ครอบครัวคนไทย                       ครอบครัวเจ้าของภาษา                       หอพักนานาชาติ

11. ระหว่างที่อยู่ในประเทศนั้นๆ คุณใช้ภาษาอังกฤษเพื่อจุดประสงค์ใดบ้าง (สามารถตอบได้มากกว่า 1 ข้อ)

- ทักทายทั่วไป
- ทุกวัน                       \_\_\_\_ ครั้ง/สัปดาห์                       \_\_\_\_ ครั้ง/เดือน                       อื่นๆ (ระบุ) \_\_\_\_
- คุยเรื่องงาน
- ทุกวัน                       \_\_\_\_ ครั้ง/สัปดาห์                       \_\_\_\_ ครั้ง/เดือน                       อื่นๆ (ระบุ) \_\_\_\_
- คุยเรื่องส่วนตัว
- ทุกวัน                       \_\_\_\_ ครั้ง/สัปดาห์                       \_\_\_\_ ครั้ง/เดือน                       อื่นๆ (ระบุ) \_\_\_\_
- อื่นๆ (ระบุ) \_\_\_\_\_
- ทุกวัน                       \_\_\_\_ ครั้ง/สัปดาห์                       \_\_\_\_ ครั้ง/เดือน                       อื่นๆ (ระบุ) \_\_\_\_

## ส่วนที่ 2 ประวัติการสอน

12. ระยะเวลาในการสอนภาษาอังกฤษ

- 1 เดือน-5 ปี     6-10 ปี     11-15 ปี     16-20 ปี     21 ปีขึ้นไป

13. ปัจจุบันคุณสอนภาษาอังกฤษให้กับนักเรียนในระดับชั้นใด (สามารถตอบได้มากกว่า 1 ข้อ)

- ประถมศึกษา     มัธยมศึกษาตอนต้น     มัธยมศึกษาตอนปลาย  
 ปวช. - ปวส.     อุดมศึกษา     อื่นๆ (ระบุ) \_\_\_\_\_

14. วิชาภาษาอังกฤษที่คุณสอนเป็นทักษะด้านใด (สามารถตอบได้มากกว่า 1 ข้อ)

- การฟัง     การพูด     การอ่าน     การเขียน     รวม 4 ทักษะ

15. คุณคิดว่าการเป็นครูสอนภาษาอังกฤษมีส่วนช่วยให้คุณใช้ภาษาอังกฤษได้หรือไม่

- ได้     ไม่ได้    (หากไม่ได้ ข้ามไปตอบข้อ 17)

16. ถ้าช่วยได้ ช่วยอย่างไร (กรุณาตอบเพียง 1 ข้อที่ตรงกับสถานการณ์ของคุณที่สุด)

- ช่วยให้มีโอกาสฟังและพูดภาษาอังกฤษง่ายๆ ในชีวิตประจำวัน  
 ช่วยให้ฟังและพูดภาษาอังกฤษได้คล่องขึ้น  
 ช่วยให้ฟังและพูดภาษาอังกฤษได้ถูกต้องตามหลักไวยากรณ์ และเหมาะสมกับสถานการณ์ต่างๆ เช่น การแสดงความเสียใจ  
 ช่วยให้ฟังและพูดภาษาอังกฤษได้คล่องและถูกต้องตามหลักไวยากรณ์ และเหมาะสมกับสถานการณ์ต่างๆ เช่น การแสดงความเสียใจ  
 อื่นๆ (ระบุ) \_\_\_\_\_

17. ในสถาบันที่คุณสอน มีอาจารย์ชาวต่างชาติที่เป็นเจ้าของภาษาอังกฤษหรือไม่

- มี     ไม่มี    (หากไม่มี ข้ามไปตอบข้อ 20)

18. คุณได้ใช้ภาษาอังกฤษกับอาจารย์ชาวต่างชาติที่เป็นเจ้าของภาษาอังกฤษในที่ทำงานหรือไม่

ได้ใช้                       ไม่ได้ใช้                      (หากไม่ได้ใช้ ข้ามไปตอบข้อ 20)

19. ถ้าได้ใช้ ใช้เพื่อจุดประสงค์ใด และบ่อยแค่ไหน (สามารถตอบได้มากกว่า 1 ข้อ)

ทักทายทั่วไป

ทุกวัน                       \_\_\_ ครั้ง/สัปดาห์                       \_\_\_ ครั้ง/เดือน                       อื่นๆ (ระบุ) \_\_\_

คุยเรื่องงาน

ทุกวัน                       \_\_\_ ครั้ง/สัปดาห์                       \_\_\_ ครั้ง/เดือน                       อื่นๆ (ระบุ) \_\_\_

คุยเรื่องส่วนตัว

ทุกวัน                       \_\_\_ ครั้ง/สัปดาห์                       \_\_\_ ครั้ง/เดือน                       อื่นๆ (ระบุ) \_\_\_

อื่นๆ (ระบุ) \_\_\_\_\_

ทุกวัน                       \_\_\_ ครั้ง/สัปดาห์                       \_\_\_ ครั้ง/เดือน                       อื่นๆ (ระบุ) \_\_\_

### ส่วนที่ 3 กิจกรรมการใช้ภาษาอังกฤษ

20. นอกเวลาทำงาน คุณมีโอกาสนำภาษาอังกฤษในชีวิตประจำวันหรือไม่

มี                                       ไม่มี                                      (หากไม่มี ข้ามไปตอบข้อ 22)

21. ถ้ามี คุณนำภาษาอังกฤษเพื่อจุดประสงค์ใด และบ่อยแค่ไหน (สามารถตอบได้มากกว่า 1 ข้อ)

คุยกับเพื่อนชาวต่างชาติ (ตัวต่อตัว)

ทุกวัน                       \_\_\_ ครั้ง/สัปดาห์                       \_\_\_ ครั้ง/เดือน                       อื่นๆ (ระบุ) \_\_\_

คุยกับเพื่อนชาวต่างชาติทางอินเทอร์เน็ต (Chat on line)

ทุกวัน                       \_\_\_ ครั้ง/สัปดาห์                       \_\_\_ ครั้ง/เดือน                       อื่นๆ (ระบุ) \_\_\_

- ติดต่อกับเพื่อนชาวต่างชาติทางอิเล็กทรอนิกส์เมลล์ (E-mail)
- ทุกวัน     \_\_\_ ครั้ง/สัปดาห์     \_\_\_ ครั้ง/เดือน     อื่นๆ (ระบุ)\_\_\_
- คุยกับเพื่อนชาวต่างชาติทางโทรศัพท์
- ทุกวัน     \_\_\_ ครั้ง/สัปดาห์     \_\_\_ ครั้ง/เดือน     อื่นๆ (ระบุ)\_\_\_
- ดูภาพยนตร์ หรือละครทีวีภาษาอังกฤษ
- ทุกวัน     \_\_\_ ครั้ง/สัปดาห์     \_\_\_ ครั้ง/เดือน     อื่นๆ (ระบุ)\_\_\_
- ดูรายการวาไรตี้ หรือทอล์คโชว์ภาษาอังกฤษ
- ทุกวัน     \_\_\_ ครั้ง/สัปดาห์     \_\_\_ ครั้ง/เดือน     อื่นๆ (ระบุ)\_\_\_
- อ่านนิยาย เรื่องสั้น หรือการ์ตูนภาษาอังกฤษ
- ทุกวัน     \_\_\_ ครั้ง/สัปดาห์     \_\_\_ ครั้ง/เดือน     อื่นๆ (ระบุ)\_\_\_
- อ่านวารสาร นิตยสาร หรือหนังสือพิมพ์ภาษาอังกฤษ
- ทุกวัน     \_\_\_ ครั้ง/สัปดาห์     \_\_\_ ครั้ง/เดือน     อื่นๆ (ระบุ)\_\_\_
- หนังสือที่สอนเกี่ยวกับการสนทนาภาษาอังกฤษ
- ทุกวัน     \_\_\_ ครั้ง/สัปดาห์     \_\_\_ ครั้ง/เดือน     อื่นๆ (ระบุ)\_\_\_
- เรียนเสริมความรู้กับสถาบันสอนภาษา เช่น AUA
- ทุกวัน     \_\_\_ ครั้ง/สัปดาห์     \_\_\_ ครั้ง/เดือน     อื่นๆ (ระบุ)\_\_\_
- หาข้อมูลที่เป็นภาษาอังกฤษทางอินเทอร์เน็ต
- ทุกวัน     \_\_\_ ครั้ง/สัปดาห์     \_\_\_ ครั้ง/เดือน     อื่นๆ (ระบุ)\_\_\_
- อื่นๆ (ระบุ) \_\_\_\_\_
- ทุกวัน     \_\_\_ ครั้ง/สัปดาห์     \_\_\_ ครั้ง/เดือน     อื่นๆ (ระบุ)\_\_\_



#### ส่วนที่ 4 ความตระหนักรู้ในการเรียน และการใช้ภาษาอังกฤษ

ข้อ 22 – 30 กรุณาทำเครื่องหมาย / ในช่องที่คุณต้องการเลือก เพื่อระบุระดับความสำคัญ

1 = น้อยที่สุด      2 = น้อย      3 = ปานกลาง      4 = มาก      5 = มากที่สุด

	1	2	3	4	5
22. คุณคิดว่าหากมีความสามารถในการใช้ภาษาอังกฤษแล้ว ควรใช้ให้ถูกต้องและดีที่สุด					
23. คุณเรียนรู้วัฒนธรรมของเจ้าของภาษาอังกฤษ					
24. คุณคิดว่าคู่สนทนาที่มีอิทธิพลต่อการใช้ภาษาอังกฤษ					
25. คุณพยายามใช้ภาษาอังกฤษเมื่อมีโอกาส					
26. คุณสังเกตข้อผิดพลาดในการใช้ภาษาอังกฤษของตัวเอง และปรับปรุงให้ดีขึ้น					
27. เมื่อคุณเรียนรู้สำนวน หรือประโยคใหม่ๆ จากชาวต่างชาติ หรือจากการดูหนัง ฟังเพลง คุณจะจดบันทึกไว้					
28. คุณค้นคว้าความหมายของสำนวน หรือประโยคที่คุณจดบันทึก และศึกษาว่ามันใช้อย่างไร ในสถานการณ์ใด					
29. คุณพยายามนำสำนวน หรือประโยคที่จดบันทึก มาใช้และฝึกฝนกับเพื่อน					
30. คุณสงสัย และหาความเหมือนและความต่างของการใช้ประโยคภาษาไทยกับภาษาอังกฤษ					

\*\*\*\*\* ขอขอบคุณค่ะ \*\*\*\*\*

## APPENDIX D

### Interview Questions (English Version)

1. During the ODCT, did you take into account the interlocutor's social status in the given situation before you made the utterance? How?
2. During the ODCT, did you consider the interlocutor's social distance in the given situation before making the utterance? How?

### คำถามในการสัมภาษณ์ (Thai Version)

1. ในระหว่างการทำแบบทดสอบความสามารถทางวจนปฏิบัติศาสตร์ คุณได้คำนึงถึงสถานะทางสังคมของกลุ่มสนทนา ก่อนที่คุณจะพูดในแต่ละสถานการณ์หรือไม่ อย่างไร
2. ในระหว่างการทำแบบทดสอบความสามารถทางวจนปฏิบัติศาสตร์ คุณได้คำนึงถึงระยะห่างทางสังคมของกลุ่มสนทนา ก่อนที่คุณจะพูดในแต่ละสถานการณ์หรือไม่ อย่างไร

## APPENDIX E

### The Participants' Demographic Information

Sub	Sex	Age	Educational background	Teaching experience	Teaching level
1	F	50	B.A in English	> 21 years	Lower & Upper Secondary
2	M	45	B.A in Psychology	> 21 years	Primary
3	F	44	B.A in English literature and language	16-20 years	Lower & Upper Secondary
4	M	23	B.A in English	< 5 years	University
5	M	32	B.A in Economics	< 5 years	Lower Secondary
6	F	28	B.A in Business English	< 5 years	Lower Secondary
7	F	29	B.A in English	< 5 years	Vocational
8	F	25	B.A in Japanese	< 5 years	Primary
9	F	25	B.A in English	< 5 years	Primary
10	F	26	B.A in English	< 5 years	University
11	F	38	B.A in English	11-15 years	Upper Secondary
12	F	40	B.A in French	16-20 years	Upper Secondary
13	F	26	B.A in English	< 5 years	University
14	M	27	B.A in English	< 5 years	Lower Secondary
15	M	39	B.A in English	11-15 years	Upper Secondary
16	F	29	B.A in English	< 5 years	Lower & Upper Secondary
17	F	26	B.A in English	< 5 years	Vocational
18	F	23	B.A in English	< 5 years	Primary
19	F	24	B.A in English	< 5 years	Primary
20	F	24	B.A in English	< 5 years	Vocational
21	F	26	B.A in Business English	< 5 years	Vocational
22	F	26	B.A in Malay	< 5 years	Primary
23	F	45	B.A in English	11-15 years	Primary
24	F	29	B.A in English	6-10 years	Vocational
25	F	24	B.A in English	< 5 years	Lower & Upper Secondary
26	M	24	B.A in English	< 5 years	Primary
27	F	31	B.A in English	< 5 years	Primary
28	M	40	B.A in Literature	6-10 years	University
29	F	27	B.A in English	< 5 years	University

Note: Sub=Subject, F=Female, M=Male

## VITAE

**Name** Miss Suratchawadee Pinyo

**Student ID** 5111120019

### **Educational Attainment**

<b>Degree</b>	<b>Name of Institution</b>	<b>Year of Graduation</b>
Bachelor of Arts (English)	Prince of Songkla University, Pattani Campus, Pattani	2000

### **List of Publication and Proceedings**

Pinyo, S., Aksornjarung, P., & Laohawiriyanon, C. (2010). Pragmatic Competence in Requests: A Case Study with Thai English Teachers [Abstract]. *Proceedings of the 2<sup>nd</sup> International Conference on Humanities and Social Sciences*, Thailand: Prince of Songkla University (p.46).