



**University of Sistan and Baluchestan
Faculty of Humanities
Department of English Language and Literature**

**The Effect of Consciousness-Raising Listening Prompts on the Perception of
the Speech Act of Apology in Iranian EFL Context**

**M.A. Thesis
Submitted to the English Department of the Faculty of Humanities, University
of Sistan and Baluchestan, in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
M.A. Degree in Teaching English as a Foreign Language**

Supervisor: Dr. Esmaeel Nourmohammadi

Advisor: Dr. Giti Mousapour Negari

**By
Ali Zangoei**

**Zahedan, Iran
September, 2013**

In the Name of God



University of Sistan and Baluchestan
Faculty of Humanities
Department of English Language and Literature

We hereby approve that this thesis by Ali Zangoei entitled

**The Effect of Consciousness-Raising Listening Prompts on the Perception of
the Speech Act of Apology in Iranian EFL Context**

be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts (M.A.) in
Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL).

Committee on the Oral Examination:

Supervisor: Dr. Esmael Nourmohammadi

Advisor: Dr. Giti Mousapour Negari

First Examiner: Dr. Farrokhlagha Heidari

Second Examiner: Dr. Abdullah Sarani

Head of the Department of the English Language and Literature: Dr. Yahya Keikhai

Zahedan, Iran
September, 2013

DEDICATION

To my beloved family, for their endless love, patience, and devotion

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It would not have been possible to write this thesis without the help and support of the kind people around me; to only some of them it is possible to give particular mentioning here. First and foremost, I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Esmaeel Nourmohammadi, whose expertise, understanding, and patience, added considerably to my experience. I appreciate his vast knowledge and skill in many areas and his invaluable assistance in writing this thesis.

A very special thanks goes out to my advisor Dr. Giti Mousapour Negari, whose help, stimulating suggestions and encouragement helped me in writing this thesis. She is the one professor who truly made a difference in my life. I doubt that I will ever be able to convey my appreciation fully, but I owe her my gratitude from the bottom of my heart.

I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation to Dr. Farrokhlagha Heidari and Dr. Abdullah Sarani, whose constant help in conceptualizing the perceptions of pragmatics, focus on form/ focus on forms, and listening comprehension skill provided me invaluable data on my research. I sincerely thank Dr. Yahya Keikhai, Head of the Department of the English Language and Literature, and the other members of the Department, especially Dr. Abas Ali Ahangar.

I would like to express my thanks to Dr. Zohre Eslami-Rasekh, Associate Professor at Texas A&M University, and also my dear friend Dr. Ali Derakhshan for their help, compassionate, and providing me

with the necessary information in the field of pragmatics in general and the speech act of apology in particular. I am also deeply indebted to Dr. Mehdi Jabbari, at Ferdowsi University, for his help with the statistical analyses in this project.

I would like to express my thanks to those at the "foreign languages institution" where I collected my data, for help and permission to collect data on-site. Further, I thank my family for their always encouragement, unquestioned support, and unconditional love.

In conclusion, I recognize that this research would not have been possible without the help of my Precious God, who helped me through the most difficult time in life, and the support of many other people. I express my heartfelt thanks to all of them.

ABSTRACT

The aim of the present study is threefold. First, it attempts to explore the effect of consciousness-raising listening prompts on the perception of the speech act of apology by Iranian EFL learners. Second, it investigates whether there is any significant difference between Iranian male and female learners' perception of the speech act of apology regarding consciousness-raising listening prompts. And third, it compares the students' language preferences in experimental group before and after the instruction. Sixty four upper-intermediate English learners participated in the study, thirty four of whom were males and thirty of whom were females with an age range of 17 to 27 years old. They were divided into two intact homogeneous groups, one of which (control group) received only listening prompts for learning English apologies and the other one (experimental group) took advantage of listening prompts together with consciousness-raising activities for the same apologies. For the first and second aims, a multiple-choice discourse completion task test of apology speech act, and for the third aim a students' language learning preferences questionnaire was used as both the pre and posttest. The results indicated that consciousness-raising listening prompts lead to a better learning of the English apologies. In addition, the results suggested that there was no significant difference between the male and female Iranian EFL learners in both groups taught through listening prompts. And finally, the results revealed that except for the expression of satisfaction in English progress, no significant difference has been found in the students' language learning preferences before and after the instruction.

Keywords: pragmatics, pragmatic competence, interlanguage pragmatics, pragmatic perception, speech act, apology, consciousness-raising, listening prompts

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|----------------------------|-------------|
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS..... | i |
| ABSTRACT..... | iii |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS..... | v |
| LIST OF TABLES..... | ix |
| LIST OF FIGURES..... | xii |
| LIST OF APPENDICES..... | xiii |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS..... | xiv |

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

| | |
|---|----|
| 1.1 Background of the Study..... | 1 |
| 1.2 Statement of the Problem and Purpose of the Study | 5 |
| 1.3 Significance of the Study | 9 |
| 1.4 Research Questions | 11 |
| 1.5 Research Hypotheses | 12 |
| 1.6 Definition of the Key Terms | 12 |
| 1.6.1 Pragmatics | 12 |
| 1.6.2 Pragmatic Competence | 13 |
| 1.6.3 Interlanguage Pragmatics | 14 |
| 1.6.4 Pragmatic Perception | 14 |
| 1.6.5 Speech Act | 15 |
| 1.6.6 Apology..... | 15 |
| 1.6.7 Consciousness-raising..... | 15 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 1.6.8 Listening Prompts..... | 16 |
| 1.7 Limitations and Delimitations of the Study..... | 16 |

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

| | |
|--|----|
| 2.1 Introduction | 18 |
| 2.2 Pragmatics..... | 19 |
| 2.2.1 Pragmalinguistics and Sociopragmatics | 21 |
| 2.2.2 Pragmatic Universals and Pragmatic Failures..... | 22 |
| 2.2.3 Speech Acts as Components of Pragmatic Knowledge..... | 26 |
| 2.2.3.1 Politeness and Speech Act Theory..... | 28 |
| 2.2.3.2 New Taxonomies and Universals In Speech Acts..... | 33 |
| 2.3 Apology Speech Act..... | 36 |
| 2.3.1 Apology Speech Act Strategies..... | 40 |
| 2.3.2 Contextual Factors Affecting Apologetic Behavior..... | 48 |
| 2.3.3 Non-native Speakers' Perception of Apologies..... | 50 |
| 2.3.4 Previous Studies on Apology Speech Act..... | 51 |
| 2.4 Authentic Audio-Taped Materials as Listening Prompts..... | 55 |
| 2.5 Consciousness-raising and Types of Instruction..... | 56 |
| 2.5.1 Definition and Concepts of Consciousness..... | 57 |
| 2.5.2 Consciousness-raising Tasks..... | 61 |
| 2.6 Implicit and Explicit Instruction in Teaching Pragmatics..... | 61 |
| 2.7. Previous studies on Consciousness -raising Activities in Teaching Pragmatics and Students' Language Learning Preferences..... | 62 |

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

| | |
|--|----|
| 3.1 Introduction | 68 |
| 3.2 Participants | 68 |
| 3.3 Instrumentation | 69 |
| 3.3.1 Nelson English Language Proficiency Test..... | 69 |
| 3.3.2 Multiple Choice Pragmatic Discourse Completion Task Test . | 70 |
| 3.3.3 Students' Language Learning Preferences Questionnaire..... | 72 |
| 3.4 Materials..... | 73 |
| 3.4.1 Listening Prompts..... | 73 |
| 3.4.2 The structured Form for Listening Prompts..... | 74 |
| 3.5 Data collection Procedure | 74 |
| 3.5.1 Data Collection | 74 |
| 3.5.2 Scoring | 78 |
| 3.6 Data Analysis | 79 |

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

| | |
|---|----|
| 4.1 Introduction | 81 |
| 4.2 The homogeneity of the Two Groups | 81 |
| 4.3 Normality of the Distribution of the Sample | 83 |
| 4.4 Testing the Research Hypotheses | 86 |
| 4.4.1 Research Hypothesis 1 | 87 |
| 4.4.1.1 Descriptive Statistics..... | 87 |
| 4.4.1.2 t-test | 88 |
| 4.4.2 Research Hypothesis 2 | 89 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 4.4.2.1 Descriptive Statistics..... | 89 |
| 4.4.2.2 Two-Way ANOVA | 90 |
| 4.4.3 Research Hypothesis 3 | 92 |
| 4.4.3.1 Descriptive Statistics..... | 92 |
| 4.4.3.2 Wilcoxon signed-rank Test..... | 102 |
| 4.5 Discussion of the Findings | 105 |
| 4.5.1 Research Question 1 | 105 |
| 4.5.2 Research Question 2..... | 107 |
| 4.5.3 Research Question 3..... | 109 |
| | |
| CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH AND CONCLUSION | |
| 5.1 Introduction | 111 |
| 5.2 Summary of the Study..... | 111 |
| 5.2.1 Research Question 1..... | 112 |
| 5.2.2 Research Question 2..... | 112 |
| 5.2.3 Research Question 3 | 113 |
| 5.3 Implications of the Study | 114 |
| 5.3.1 Theoretical Implications | 114 |
| 5.3.2 Pedagogical Implications | 115 |
| 5.4 Suggestions for Further Research..... | 117 |
| 5.5 Conclusion | 118 |
| REFERENCES..... | 120 |
| APPENDICES..... | 141 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|---|------|
| 2.1 Summary of the Apology Strategies..... | 41 |
| 2.2 Combinations of Apology Strategies | 43 |
| 2.3 Explanation of Each Apologetic Semantic Formula..... | 44 |
| 4.1 Descriptive Statistics for Proficiency Test of Consciousness-Raising and Non- Consciousness-Raising Groups..... | 82 |
| 4.2 Independent Samples <i>T</i> -Test: Non- Consciousness-Raising Group Proficiency Test vs. Consciousness-Raising Group Proficiency Test..... | 82 |
| 4.3 Descriptive Statistics for Consciousness-Raising and Non- Consciousness-Raising Groups Gain Scores..... | 87 |
| 4.4 Independent-Samples <i>T</i> -Test: The Non-Consciousness-Raising Group Mean Gain Score vs. the Consciousness-Raising Group's Mean Gain Score | 88 |
| 4.5 Descriptive Statistics for the Males' and Females' Gain Scores in the Non-Consciousness-Raising and Consciousness-Raising Groups..... | 90 |
| 4.6 Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances | 91 |
| 4.7 Tests of Between-Subjects Effects..... | 91 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 4.8 Descriptive Statistics for Question 1 of Students' Language Learning Preferences Questionnaire..... | 93 |
| 4.9 Descriptive Statistics for Question 2 of Students' Language Learning Preferences Questionnaire | 93 |
| 4.10 Descriptive Statistics for Question 3 of Students' Language Learning Preferences Questionnaire | 94 |
| 4.11 Descriptive Statistics for Question 4 of Students' Language Learning Preferences Questionnaire | 94 |
| 4.12 Descriptive Statistics for Question 5 of Students' Language Learning Preferences Questionnaire | 95 |
| 4.13 Descriptive Statistics for Question 6 of Students' Language Learning Preferences Questionnaire | 96 |
| 4.14 Descriptive Statistics for Question 7 Of Students' Language Learning Preferences Questionnaire | 97 |
| 4.15 Descriptive Statistics for Question 8 of Students' Language Learning Preferences Questionnaire | 98 |
| 4.16 Descriptive Statistics for Question 9 of Students' Language Learning Preferences Questionnaire | 98 |
| 4.17 Descriptive Statistics for Question 10 of Students' Language Learning Preferences Questionnaire | 99 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 4.18 Descriptive Statistics for Question 11 of Students' Language Learning Preferences Questionnaire | 100 |
| 4.19 Descriptive Statistics for Question 12 of Students' Language Learning Preferences Questionnaire | 101 |
| 4.20 Descriptive Statistics for Question 13 of Students' Language Learning Preferences Questionnaire | 102 |
| 4.21 Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test for Question 1 to 13 of Students' Language Learning Preferences Questionnaire..... | 103 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure | Page |
|---|------|
| 2.1 Possible Strategies for Performing Face-Threatening Acts..... | 29 |
| 2.2 Consciousness in A Multistore Model of Memory..... | 58 |
| 4.1 The Distribution of All the Participants' Proficiency Scores..... | 83 |
| 4.2 The Distribution of All the Participants' Gain Scores | 84 |
| 4.3 The Distribution of the Participants' Gain Scores in the Non - Consciousness-raising Group..... | 84 |
| 4.4 The Distribution of the Participants' Gain Scores in the Consciousness-raising Group..... | 85 |
| 4.5 The Distribution of All the Participants' Scores for the Perception of Apology in the Pretest | 85 |
| 4.6 The Distribution of All the Participants' Scores For the Perception of Apology in the Posttest | 86 |

LIST OF APPENDICES

| Appendix | Page |
|---|------|
| A Nelson English Proficiency Test..... | 142 |
| B Multiple Choice Pragmatic Discourse Completion Task Test..... | 146 |
| C Students' Language Learning Preferences Questionnaire..... | 152 |
| D An Example of Apology Speech Act Listening Prompt..... | 155 |
| E The Structured Form for Listening Prompts..... | 157 |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|--------|--|
| CCSARP | Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project |
| C-R | Consciousness-raising |
| CS | Complex system |
| DCT | Discourse completion test |
| DSAs | Direct speech acts |
| EFL | English as a foreign language |
| FLA | Foreign language acquisition |
| FLI | Foreign Languages Institute |
| FLL | Foreign language learning |
| FTAs | Face- threatening acts |
| IFID | Illocutionary force indicating device |
| ILP | Interlanguage pragmatics |
| ISAs | Indirect speech acts |
| L2 | Second Language |
| LPs | Listening prompts |
| MDCT | Multiple choice pragmatic discourse completion task test |
| NELPT | Nelson English Language Proficiency Test |
| NSs | Native speakers |
| NNSs | Non-native speakers |
| OPDCT | Open-ended discourse completion tasks |
| Q | Question |

| | |
|------|-----------------------------------|
| RP | Role-play |
| TL | Target language |
| WDCT | Written discourse completion test |

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Effective communication requires more than just knowing the linguistic knowledge of the language such as phonology, morphology and syntax. In other words, in order to make learners become communicatively competent in the English language, there should be a shift from previous theoretical frameworks, which considered language as a formal system based on grammatical rules, towards a more communicative perspective (Martínez-Flor, 2004). Alcaraz (2000) points out that the shift from language usage rule to language use rule was possible due to the advent of pragmatics as a specific area of study within linguistics that favored a focus on interactional and contextual factors of the target language (TL).

Speaking a language means more than uttering a number of grammatically correct sentences. A number of comprehensive models of communicative competence (e.g., Canale & Swain, 1980; Bachman & Palmer, 1996) recognize that becoming a competent second language user involves knowing more than just the correct rules and forms of a language—it also involves knowing how to use language in social and pragmatic appropriate ways. Tanck (2002) stated that “Speakers who