**Allameh Tabataba'i University**

**Faculty of Persian Literature and Foreign Languages**

**Department of English Language and Literature**

# Variations and Patterns in Native and Non-native Interlanguage Pragmatic Rating: Effects of Rater Training, Intercultural Proficiency, and Self-assessment

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)

**Advisor:** Dr. Zia Tajeddin

**Readers:**

Dr. Mohammad Khatib
&
Dr. Fahimeh Marefat

**By: Minoo Alemi**

Tehran, Iran
September, 2012

# In the Name of God

**Allameh Tabataba'i University**

**Faculty of Persian Literature and Foreign Languages**

**Department of English Language and Literature**

# Variations and Patterns in Native and Non-native Interlanguage Pragmatic Rating: Effects of Rater Training, Intercultural Proficiency, and Self-assessment

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)

**Advisor:** Dr. Zia Tajeddin

**Readers:**

Dr. Mohammad Khatib
&
Dr. Fahimeh Marefat

**By: Minoo Alemi**

Tehran, Iran
September, 2012

**Allameh Tabataba'i University**

**Faculty of Persian Literature and Foreign Languages**

**Department of English Language and Literature**

We hereby recommend that this dissertation by

**Minoo Alemi**

entitled:

# Variations and Patterns in Native and Non-native Interlanguage Pragmatic Rating: Effects of Rater Training, Intercultural Proficiency, and Self-assessment

be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)

**Committee on final examination:**

**……** Advisor: Dr. Zia Tajeddin

**……** Reader: Dr. Mohammad Khatib

**……** Reader: Dr. Fahimeh Marefat

**……** Examiner: Dr. Mahmood Reza Ataii

**……** Examiner: Dr. Gholamreza Tajvidi

**……** Head of the Department: Dr. Mohammad Khatib

Tehran, Iran
September, 2012

# کتابخانه مرکزی دانشگاه علامه طباطبائی

**عنوان:** الگوها و تنوع نمره دهی توانش منظورشناسی توسط معلمان انگلیسی بومی و غیر بومی:تاثیر کارگاه اموزشی- زبان بینابین و خودسنجی توانایی میانفرهنگی

**نویسنده / محقق:مینو عالمی**

**مترجم:** .....

**استاد راهنما:** جناب آقای دکتر ضیا تاج الدین

**استاد مشاور:** جناب آقای دکتر محمد خطیب

**استاد مشاور:** سرکارخانم دکترفهیمه معرفت

**استاد داور:** جناب آقای دکتر محمودرضا عطایی

**استاد داور:** جناب آقای دکتر غلامرضا تجویدی

**کتابنامه:** دارد **واژه نامه:** ندارد

| **نوع پایان نامه:** | **بنیادی** | **توسعه ای** | **کاربردی** |
|---|---|---|---|
| | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**مقطع تحصیلی: دکترا** **سال تحصیلی: 92-91**

**محل تحصیل:** تهران **نام دانشگاه:** علامه طباطبائی

**دانشکده:** ادبیات فارسی و زبان های خارجی

**تعداد صفحات:** 202 **گروه آموزشی:** زبان و ادبیات انگلیسی

**کلید واژه ها به زبان فارسی:**

سنجش منظورشناسی- زبان بینابین- نمره دهی توانش منظورشناسی- زبان بینابین -کنش کلامی عذرخواهی و رد درخواست- خودسنجی توانایی میانفرهنگی- نمره دهندگان بومی- نمره دهندگان غیر بومی .

**کلید واژه ها به زبان انگلیسی:**

Interlanguage pragmatic assessment, ILP rating criteria, Speech act, Apology, Refusal, Self-assessment, Intercultural proficiency, Native raters, Non-native raters

# چکیده


**الف. موضوع و طرح مسئله (اهمیت موضوع و هدف)**

گرچه مطالعات زیادی در مورد سنجش منظورشناسی انجام شده است بررسی این مطالعات نشان می دهد که تحقیقات در مورد معیارهای معلمان بومی و غیر بومی انگلیسی در مورد سنجش تولید منظورشناسی زبان آموزان انگلیسی صورت نگرفته است .

**ب. مبانی نظری شامل مرور مختصری از منابع، چارچوب های نظری، پرسش ها و فرضیه ها:**

این تحقیق چهار هدف را دنبال میکند هدف اول یافتن معیارهای نمره دهی به تولید کنش های کلامی عذرخواهی و رد درخواست توسط معلمان انگلیسی بومی و غیر بومی دو کنشهای کلامی درو نیز تاثیر موقعیتهای تولید این زمان تکمیل گفتمان در معیارهای نمره دهی و نیز دو گروه است .

هدف دوم : کشف رابطه بین سنجش معلمان غیر بومی از توانش منظورشناسی خود و دقت نمره دهی آنان به این دو کنش کلامی در مقایسه با انگپایه معلمان بومی است .

هدف سوم : بررسی ارتباط بین توان میان فرهنگی معلمان غیر بومی و دقت نمره دهی آنان به این دو کنش کلامی در مقایسه با انگپایه معلمان بومی است .

هدف اخر این تحقیق کشف تاثیر آموزش سنجش منظورشناسی به دقت نمره دهی معلمان غیر بومی در مقایسه با نمره دهی معلمان بومی است .

**پ. روش تحقیق شامل تعریف مفاهیم، روش تحقیق، جامعه مورد تحقیق، نمونه گیری و روش های نمونه گیری، ابزار اندازه گیری، نحوه اجرای آن، شیوه گرد آوری و تجزیه و تحلیل بوداده ها:**

به منظور دستیابی به هدف تحقیق 12 موقعیت آزمون تکمیل گفتمان عذرخواهی و رد درخواست همراه با پاسخ زبان آموزان انگلیسی به هر یک از موقعیت ها توسط 50

معلم انگلیسی بومی و 50غیر بومی نمره دهی شد . علاوه بر این, این دو گروه از معلمان غیر بومی به پرسش نامه های خود ارزشیابی توان منظورشناسی و توانش میان فرهنگی پاسخ دادند . همین دسته از معلمان در کارگاه آموزش منظور شناسی شرکت کردند تا تاثیر این کارگاه بر نمره دهی آنان سنجیده شود .

**ت. یافته های تحقیق و نتیجه گیری:**

بررسی توضیحات و معیارهای معلمان برای نمره دهی به تولید کنش های کلامی عذرخواهی و رد درخواست 5 معیار برای عذرخواهی و 11 معیار برای رد درخواست را نشان داد . آمار توصیفی برای نمره دهی عذرخواهی و رد درخواست اختلاف در موقعیت های مختلف را اشکار کرد .

سپس ارتباط بین خود ارزشیابی توانش منظورشناسی و توانش میان فرهنگی با نمره دهی آزمون تکمیل گفتمان برای عذرخواهی و رد درخواست معلمان غیر بومی سنجیده و ارتباط معنی داری را نشان داد .

انگاه با استفاده از t-test و chi-square برای اندازه گیری تاثیر کارگاه آزمون سنجش منظور شناسی بر معلمان غیر بومی نتیجه و پیشرفت آنان و نزدیک شدن به معیارهای معلمان بومی را سنجیده شد. نتیجه این تحقیق ضرورت کارگاه آزمون سنجش منظورشناسی را برای معلمان غیر بومی خاطرنشان می کند .

صحت اطلاعات مندرج در این فرم بر اساس محتوای پایان نامه و ضوابط مندرج در فرم را گواهی می نمایم.

نام استاد راهنما: دکتر ضیا تاج الدین

سمت علمی:داد شد یار

نام دانشکده: ادبیات فارسی و زبان های خارجی

رئیس کتابخانه

# Acknowledgements

It has been such a privilege to be helped and supported by leading scholars throughout my program of study. I would like to express sincere gratitude to my dissertation committee members. First of all, I am very grateful and indebted to my advisor, Dr. Tajeddin for his critical and invaluable feedback, guidance, encouragement, and ongoing support. Actually he was a source of motivation for my academic achievements. I would also like to extend my sincere gratitude to my thesis readers, Dr. Khatib and Dr. Marefat, for their sage advice and valuable feedback.

I am also so grateful to Dr. Fahim, Dr. Birjandi, and my dissertation examiners,Dr. Ataii and Dr. Tajvidi.

I would also like to express many thanks to Dr. Meghdari, the head of Department of Languages and Linguistics in Sharif University of Technology, for his cooperation and encouragement in my workplace during my study. I would also like to thank the participants in my study, including native and non-native teachers who sincerely and patiently completed the questionnaires. I am also indebted to many of my friends for their support.

Last but by no means least, I would like to show my deepest gratitude to my family including my husband and my sons who have always been the reason for all my life achievements.

# Abstract

Although there are studies on pragmatic assessment, to date, literature has been almost silent about native and non-native English raters' criteria for the assessment of EFL learners' pragmatic performance. Focusing on this topic, this study pursued four purposes. The first one was to find criteria for rating the speech acts of apology and refusal in L2 by native and non-native English teachers and to examine if apology and refusal situations make any variations in the criteria applied to the rating of L2 apology and refusal discourse completion tasks (DCTs). The second was to discover the interrelationship of the non-native raters' self-assessment of their pragmatic competence and their accuracy of rating the two speech acts against native benchmark. The third was to explore the interrelationship of the non-native raters' intercultural proficiency and their accuracy of rating the two speech acts against native benchmark. The final purpose of this study was to uncover the possible effect of the training session on the accuracy of non-native raters' ratings against native benchmark. To this end, 12 different pragmatic situations for apology and refusal DCTs accompanied by an L2 learner's response to each situation were rated by 50 native and 50 non-native English teacher raters. Besides rating, the raters were asked to write their criteria for rating the response to each DCT situation.The content analysis of raters' comments revealed five apology and eleven refusal criteria. The descriptive statistics for apology and refusal rating indicated variations across situations. Then correlations between non-native raters' self-assessment of their pragmatic competence and their accuracy of speech act ratings as well as between their ratings and their intercultural proficiency revealed that there were strong relationships among them. A number of *t*-tests and chi-squares were computed to see the effect of the training session. The

results indicate that non-native raters approached native benchmark in terms of rating and criteria after the training session. This study bears evidence to the necessity of rater training and informed, rubric-based pragmatic rating.

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements ..... i

Abstract ..... ii

Table of Contents ..... iv

List of Tables ..... ix

List of Figures ..... xii

List of Abbreviation ..... xii

List of Appendices ..... xiv

**Chapter 1: Introduction ..... 1-16**

1.1. Background ..... 2

1.2. Statement of the Problem ..... 6

1.3. Significance of the Study ..... 7

1.4. Purpose of the Study ..... 9

1.5. Research Questions ..... 11

1.6. Research Hypotheses ..... 12

1.7. Definition of Key Terms ..... 13

1.7.1. Discourse completion task (DCT) ..... 13

1.7.2. Intercultural proficiency ..... 13

1.7.3. Interlanguage pragmatics ..... 13

1.7.4. Self-assessment ..... 14

1.7.5. Rater bias ..... 14

1.7.6. Rater training and workshop ..... 15

1.8. Limitations and delimitations of the Study ..... 16

**Chapter 2: Review of the Literature ..... 17-67**

2.1. Communicative Competence .....18
2.2. Pragmatic Competence .....20
2.3. Interlanguage Pragmatics (ILP) .....21
2.3.1. Definition .....21
2.3.2. Components of pragmatic knowledge .....22
2.3.3. Speech acts in ILP .....23
2.3.4. Interlanguage pragmatic instruction .....27
2.4. Speech Acts of Apology and Refusal .....33
2.4.1. Introduction to speech acts .....33
2.4.2. Concept of apology and strategy framework.....33
2.4.3. A brief review of studies of apology .....38
2.4.4. Concept of refusal and strategy framework.....40
2.4.5. A brief review of studies on refusal.....43
2.5. Pragmatic Assessment .....46
2.5.1. Pragmatic assessment tasks .....46
2.5.2. Self-assessment.....51
2.5.3. Pragmatic rating.....54
2.5.4. Rating and intercultural competence .....55
2.5.5. Rater bias .....59
2.5.6. Rater training in ILP .....63
2.5.6.1. The concept of rater training .....63
2.5.6.2. Studies on rater training .....64
**Chapter 3: Methodology**..... **68-81**

3.1. Participants....69
3.1.1. EFL learners....70
3.1.2. Non-native English speaker raters (NNESRs) ....70
3.1.3. Native English speaker raters (NESRs)....70
3.2. Instruments....71
3.2.1. Written Discourse completion task (WDCT) ....71
Apology ....72
Refusal....72
3.2.2. Self-assessment questionnaire ....73
3.2.3. Intercultural proficiency questionnaire....73
3.2.4. Interlanguage pragmatic rating scale....75
3.2.5. Rater training program/workshop....76
3.3. Design ....77
3.4. Data Collection Procedure....77
3.4.1. Phase one ....77
3.4.2. Phase two ....78
3.4.3. Phase three ....78
3.4.4. Phase four (treatment)....78
3.4.5. Phase five....79
3.5. Data Analysis....80
**Chapter 4: Results and Discussion .... 82-148**
4.1. Results ....83
4.1.1 Research Question 1 ....83

4.1.1.1. Apology criteria .....84

4.1.1.2. Refusal criteria.....96

4.1.2. Research Question 2 ..... 109

4.1.2.1. Apology rating.....109

4.1.2.2. Refusal rating.....111

4.1.3. Research Question 3 .....113

4.1.3.1. Inter-rater reliability of apology .....113

4.1.3.2. Inter-rater reliability of refusal .....114

4.1.4. Research Question 4 .....115

4.1.5. Research Question 5 .....117

4.1.6. Research Question 6 .....120

4.1.7. Research Question 7 .....122

4.2. Discussion .....134

4.2.1. Discussion on pragmatic rating criteria .....134

4.2.1.1. Apology criteria.....135

4.2.1.2. Refusal criteria.....138

4.2.2. Discussion on pragmatic rating accuracy .....141

4.2.3. Discussion on pragmatic self-assessment.....143

4.2.4. Discussion on intercultural proficiency .....144

4.2.5. Discussion on the effect of training on pragmatic rating .....146

**Chapter 5: Conclusion, Implications, and Suggestions for Further Research.....149-158**

5.1. Concluding Remarks .....150

5.2. Implications of the Study.....154

5.3. Suggestions for Further Studies.....156

**References**.....**159-182**

**Appendices** .....**183-202**

## List of Tables

Table 2.1 The speech act sets for apologies .....37

Table 2.2 The speech act sets for refusals ..... 42

Table 4.1 Frequency of apology criteria in different situations among native and non-native raters before and after the workshop .....86

Table 4.2 Frequency of refusal criteria among native and non-native raters before and after the workshop .....99

Table 4.3 Descriptive statistics for apology rating by native and non-native raters before and after the workshop .....109

Table 4.4 Descriptive statistics for refusal rating by native and non-native raters before and after the workshop .....111

Table 4.5 Intraclass correlation coefficient between non-native raters before the workshop and native raters for apology .....113

Table 4.6 Intraclass correlation coefficient between non-native raters after the workshop and native raters for apology .....113

Table 4.7 Intraclass correlation coefficient between non-native raters before the workshop and native raters for refusal .....114

Table 4.8 Intraclass correlation coefficient between non-native raters after the workshop and native raters for refusal .....114

Table 4.9 Pragmatic self-assessment for non-native raters before and after the workshop .....115

Table 4.10 Descriptive statistics of criteria non-native raters mentioned before and after the workshop..... 116

Table 4.11 Descriptive statistics of pragmatic pre-self-assessment of high and low non-native raters .....117

Table 4.12 Descriptive table of post self-assessment of high and Low non-native raters.....117

Table 4.13 Correlation coefficient between speech act ratings by native raters and high and low pre-self-assessment non-native raters of non-native raters.....118

Table 4.14 Correlation coefficient between speech act ratings by native raters and high and low post-self-assessment non-native raters .....119

Table 4.15 Descriptive statistics of intercultural competence of non-native raters .....120

Table 4.16 Correlation among intercultural components .....120

Table 4.17 Descriptive statistics of intercultural proficiency of high and low non-native raters.....122

Table 4.18 Correlation between speech act ratings by native raters and non-native raters with high and low intercultural proficiency .....123

Table 4.19 Chi-square for the frequencies of apology criteria between non-native raters before and after the workshop and native raters.....124

Table 4.20 Chi-square for the frequencies of refusal criteria between

non-native raters before and after the workshop and native raters....124

Table 4.21 Descriptive statistics of ratings by non-native raters before the workshop and native raters for apology....125

Table 4.22 *T*-test of apology ratings by non-native raters before the workshop and native raters....126

Table 4.23 Descriptive statistics of ratings by non-native raters before the workshop and native raters for refusal....127

Table 4.24 *T*-test of refusal ratings by non-native raters before the workshop and native raters....127

Table 4.25 Descriptive statistics of ratings by non-native raters after the workshop and native raters for apology....128

Table 4.26 *T*-test of apology ratings by non-native raters after the workshop and native raters....129

Table 4.27 Descriptive statistics of ratings by non-native raters after the workshop and native raters for refusal....129

Table 4.28 *T*-test of refusal ratings by non-native raters after the workshop and native raters....130

Table 4.29 Descriptive statistics of apology ratings by non-native raters before and after the workshop....130

Table 4.30 Paired samples *t*-test of apology ratings by non-native raters before and after the workshop....131

Table 4.31 Descriptive statistics of refusal rating by nonnative Raters before and after the workshop....132

Table 4.32 Paired-samples *t*-test of refusal ratings by non-native raters before and after the workshop....132

# List of Figures

Figure 4.1 Apology criteria among native and non-native before and after the workshop .....88

Figure 4.2 Refusal criteria among native, non-native before and after the workshop .....100

# List of Abbreviations

ACTFL : American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages

CA : Conversation Analysis

DCT : Discourse Completion Task

DRPT : Discourse Role-Play Task

DSAT : Discourse Self-Assessment Task

DSAT : Discourse Self-Assessment Tests

EFL : English as a Foreign Language

ELT : English Language Teaching

ESL : English as Second Language

FTA : Face-Threatening Act

ICC : Intercultural Competence

IELTS : International English Language Test System

IFID : Illocutionary Force Indicating Device

ILP : Interlanguage Pragmatics

KFL : Korean as a Foreign Language

L1 : First Language

L2 : Second Language

M.A : Master's of Art

MDCT : Multiple-choice Discourse Completion Task

MFRM : Many-Facet Rasch Measurement

NES : Native English Speaker

NESR : Native English Speaker Rater

NNES : Non-Native English Speaker

NNESR : Non-Native English Speaker Rater

ODCT : Oral Discourse Completion Task

OET : Occupation English Teaching

RPSA : Role-Play Self-Assessment

RQ : Research Question

SD : Standard Deviation

SLA : Second Language Acquisition

TSAPP : Teachers' Self-Assessment of their Pragmatic Proficiency

TSASA : Teachers' Self-Assessment of their Speaking Ability

WDCT : Written Discourse Completion Task

## List of Appendices

A. Speech Act Rating.....184