Delving into Speech Act of Suggestion: A Case of Iranian EFL Learners

Reza Pishghadam (Ph.D.)
Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran
Email: rpishghadam@gmail.com

Maryam Sharafadini (M.A)
Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran
Email: maryam.sharafadini@gmail.com

Abstract

This study intends to investigate how Iranian EFL learners utilize suggestion speech act. To this end, 150 Iranian English learners took part in this research and completed a DCT (Discourse Completion Task) consisting of 6 situations in which learners' suggestion act was explored. Percentage and Chi-square were employed to analyze the data. The findings were compared with those of Jiang (2006) in order to find out the similarities and differences between Persian and English suggestion strategies. The study results indicated discrepancy in three types of suggestion samples between natives and non-natives. Moreover, gender and language proficiency were found to play a significant role in the production of suggestion strategies. Finally, the results were discussed in the context of language learning and teaching.

Key terms: Pragmatic competence, Speech act, Suggestion act, EFL context

Introduction

Many researchers focus on the need for the rules of producing "communicatively appropriate performance" (e.g. Schmidt & Richards, 1980, P. 1; Uso-Juan & Martinez-Flor, 2008) as well as proper development of pragmatic competence (e.g. Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1996; Celce-Marcia, Dornyei & Thurrell , 1995, as cited in Fernandez Guerra & Martinez-Flor, 2005). As a matter of fact, many learners may not be aware of socially and culturally appropriate forms which may lead to communication break-down or communication conflict. Therefore, according to Schmidt and Richards (1980), we should try to appreciate a theory which account for language use among which speech act theory plays a crucial role.

Speech act theory is concerned with uses of language. Schmidt and Richards (1980) propose that generally speech act includes all the acts we do while speaking though, this is a broad definition. The main contribution of speech act theory is to explanation of communicative competence. Pragmatic speech acts such as invitations, refusals, suggestions, and apologies are significant components of communicative competence. Different approaches analyzing communicative competence has considered pragmatic competence as the basic component, on the other hand, within pragmatic competence increasing attention has been drawn to interlanguage pragmatic (ILP) studies which most of them have been carried out on production of different speech acts. Thus, the study of speech acts appears to be necessary to the understanding of intercultural studies. Within the last few years, great deal of studies have been carried out in regard to different speech acts, such as: request (e.g. Jalilifar, 2009; Taguchi, 2006), apology (e.g. Eslami-Rasekh & Mardani, 2010; Harris, Grainger & Mullany, 2006) , compliment (e.g. Sharifian, 2008; Wolfson, 1981) and refusals (e.g. Allami & Naeimi, 2010; Tanck , 2002) among which speech act of suggestion has absorbed scant attention.

We regularly use suggestions in our daily interactions. We receive suggestions from different people: we may receive personal suggestions from our friends or relatives; we may get professional suggestions from doctors or professors. Suggestions also arise in educational environments such as class in which students ask for teachers' help and hints. Being informed of intricacies of suggestion speech act, we should be cautious while suggesting. Non-natives may not be cognizant of the different influence of direct or indirect suggestions. Therefore, the present study intends to investigate the suggestion strategies made by Iranian EFL learners in order to study whether their suggestions map with those of natives and to find the differences and similarities between native and non-native speakers of English. Furthermore, many pragmatic studies have been involved with investigating the influential factors in speech act performance such as gender (e.g. Allami, 2006; Bryant Smith, 2009; Sum-hung Li, 2010) and proficiency (e.g. Allami & Naimi, 2010; Nguyen, 2007; Wannaruk , 2008). Thus, this study aims to investigate gender influence and probe whether participants with different language proficiency levels have a better pragmatic competence with respect to their suggestions.

Theoretical Framework

Martinez-Flor and Uso-Juan (2006) regarded pragmatics as a linguistic concept related to language use which involves speakers' intentions while communicating utterances in particular contexts and considered notion of pragmatics as a reaction to Chomsky's abstract construct of language in which grammar played a predominant role. Pragmatics has also been implemented in the field of second language acquisition and more specifically in construction of SLA models (Celce-Murcia et al, 1995 as cited in Fernandez Guerra & Martinez-Flor, 2005; Martinez-Flor & Uso-Juan, 2006). Pragmatic speech acts such as requests, apologies, compliments and suggestions are significant components of communicative competence. Therefore, learners to be communicatively competent in a second or foreign language demand not only to promote their grammatical knowledge but also to improve their pragmatic competence. To perform speech acts appropriately, two types of knowledge are required: sociopragmatics and sociolinguistics (Leech, 1983; Thomas, 1983 as cited in Uso-Juan & Martinez-Flor, 2008). The former indicates when to perform a speech act and what is appropriate in a certain condition, whereas the latter is concerned with linguistic forms related to the speech act. Searle (1976) also differentiates pragmatic speech acts into 5 catagories of representatives (we tell people how things are), directives (get people to do something), commissives (the speaker is committed to do something), expressives (feelings and attitudes are conveyed) and declarations (they cause to happen a change). Suggestions belong to directive acts.

As Barenjee and Carrell (1988, p. 319) state, while making suggestion several concerns should be observed: "urgency of the suggestion", "degree of embarrassment in the situation" and "social distance and power between speaker and the hearer". Thus, the speaker should try to mitigate the effect of offence on the hearer by some politeness strategies. Moreover, learners' ability to use speech act samples appropriately is a major component of pragmatic competence. Fraser (1983, p. 29, as cited in Allami & Naeimi, 2010) defines pragmatic competence as ''the knowledge how an addressee determines what a speaker is saying and recognizes intended illocutionary force conveyed through subtle attitudes in the speaker's utterance''. Generally, speech act studies can be discussed in two categories. First, those which explore speech acts' strategies in regard to speakers' native language (Al-kahtani, 2005; Cheng, 2009; Karimnia & Afghari, 2010; Sharifian, 2005) and second, those which investigate characteristics of non-native speakers' speech acts in comparison to native speakers(Ahmadian & Vahid Dastjerdi, 2010; Al-Eryani, 2007; Bryant Smith, 2009; Parvaresh & Eslami Rasekh, 2009; Wannaruk, 2008; Wolfson, 1981). Banerjee and Carrell (1988) have discussed suggestions in ESL. 28 native speakers of Chinese or Malay and 12 native speakers of American English responded a DCT including 60 suggesting situations. The study intended to determine to what extent, native speakers and nonnative speakers vary in their suggestion strategies.

Furthermore, some implications were recommended for the ESL classroom teacher in helping students develop their pragmatic competence. Results revealed that although suggestions made by native and nonnative speakers were basically similar in directness and frequency, number and type of politeness strategies were differe Martinez-Flor and Fukuya (2005) have operationalised FonF (Focus on Form) in the pragmatic realm. This study involved the effects of both explicit and implicit pragmatic instruction on learning head acts and downgraders in suggestions. 81 Spanish learners of English in a computer science class participated in this study for 16 weeks. During this period, learners were classified into three groups: an explicit group who received metapragmatic information on suggestions for 12 hours, an implicit group who were exposed to pragmalinguistic input enhancement and recast activities and a control group who received no treatment.

All the participants were required to perform Email and phone tasks as pre- and post-tests. Analyzing 1296 responses, the results revealed that both explicit and implicit groups made pragmatic development in the post test. Jiang (2006) described the linguistic forms of suggestion acts in both real language and ESL textbooks. Suggestion forms were compared in two authentic settings of professor–student interaction during office hours and student–student study groups on the basis of T2K-SWAL Corpus. Furthermore, three old and three recent ESL textbooks were compared to determine the extent to which textbook materials represent authentic language use. It was indicated that the new generation textbooks introduce more linguistic structures for suggestions than the old generation textbooks though, there is still a gap between real language use and ESL textbooks. The author emphasized on the contextualized pragmatic teaching. Sum-hung Li (2010) considered Cantonese students' production of suggestion samples in English (their L2) not only with Australian students, who were attended as a target-based control group, but also with other native Cantonese students in Cantonese (their L1). Participants were high school students who were required to perform an open role play.

The study results showed that syntactically, Cantonese students in their L2 employed fewer syntactic types in making suggestions whereas pragmatically, they were same in their selection of perspective, directness and politeness strategies. However, there were significant differences regarding their choice of suggestion strategies and redressive actions. Generally, regarding the literature there are narrow range of studies on suggestions but these small number of studies indicate learners have difficulty in forming appropriate strategies. Their suggestions are considered as direct and unmitigated and sometimes even rude (Jiang, 2006).

Purpose of the Study

Language learners repeatedly deal with the need to utilize different speech acts such as apologies, requests, complaints each of which constitute a series of strategies. Although defining different speech acts has been established since the 1960s (Meijers, 2007), recently there has been a shift towards empirical studies which focus on perception and production of various speech acts by EFL or ESL learners. Considering different speech acts, SLA researchers have become interested in a set of strategies in which native speakers of target language use for speech acts. Therefore, this study intends to compare and contrast non-natives' suggestion act with that of natives. Therefore, it aims to probe the following research questions:

Q1: what are the similarities and differences in the production of suggestion acts between English natives and Iranians learning English?
Q2: Is there any significant difference between males and females in their suggestion production between English natives and Iranians learning English?
Q3: Is there any significant difference between participants of different proficiency levels in their use of suggestions between English natives and Iranians learning English?

Methodology
Setting and Participants

Participants in this study consisted of 150 Iranians who were learning English in language institutes in Mashhad- a city in Iran. They involved 75 males and 75 females aged from 17 to 50. They consist of 50 intermediate, 50 upper intermediate, and 50 advanced learners. Their levels of proficiency were determined by the language institutes in which they were studying. Since English is used only in class in Iran, and has no out-of-class application for communication, English in Iran is considered as a foreign language.

Instrumentation

According to Cohen (1996), one of the means to glean the pragmatic data is (Discourse Completion Task) DCT and if it is prepared appropriately, it reveals how respondents activate their pragmatic knowledge (Martinez-Flor, 2006). Therefore, research data was collected through a DCT in which 6 natural situations were defined elaborately, and participants were required to respond as they would say in daily conversations. The DCT was designed based on the guidelines provided by Banerjee and Carrell (1988), Martinez-Flor (2006)**,** Martinez-Flor (2005), Martinez-Flor and Alcon Soler (2004), Martinez-Flor and Fukuya (2005) (see appendix). As Hudson, Detmer and Brown (1995, as cited in Martinez-flor & Alcon soler, 2004) state the content of the DCT should have a familiar context to the students. Since the DCT questionnaires did not have the sufficient interaction available in authentic discourse, a short dialogue was added to each situation and following Matsumura (2001) suggestion, learners were asked to imagine themselves in a foreign country studying English language. According to the guidelines provided by Martinez-Flor and Alcon-Soler (2004) the test instructions were given in L1 since a thorough understanding of how task should be performed is necessary for the learners. Furthermore, including both male and female participants, the situations were devised in a gender neutral way and regarding the status, to have a representative sample of authentic discourse, the situations involved inferior, equal and superior relationship. A pilot study was administrated in which 20 EFL learners took apart. Some of the participants were interviewed and had to think aloud as well. A team of specialists in L2 were asked to substantiate content validity of the DCT and consequently ambiguities and obstacles of DCT were eliminated. Moreover, to reach more reliable data, 2 raters corrected the respondents' replies.

Procedure

The DCT was distributed among participants studying English. They completed the questionnaire at the last 15 minutes of their class with the permission of their teachers. The necessary instruction was presented by the researchers in English and one example was given.   After collecting the data, responses were analyzed quantitatively. The unit of analysis was speech utterances.

In order to classify the suggestion strategies, taxonomy of suggestion was used which was adapted from the study conducted by Jiang (2006) who classified suggestion strategies to nine categories based on their grammatical features such as:

- Let's (let's try…)
- Certain modals and semi-modals (You have to. . . You need to. . . You'd/had better…)
- Wh-questions (Why don't you . . .?)
- Conditionals (If I were. . .)
- Performatives (I suggest…/ I propose..., my suggestion is … / my recommendation is …)
- Pseudo cleft structures (All you need to do is…)
- Extraposed to-clauses (It might be difficult to ...)
- Yes/ no questions (Have you heard…)
- Imperatives (do your best ...)

In fact, the data was analyzed on the levels of syntax and semantics. The frequency and percentage of suggestion formulas employed by learners in expressing suggestions was calculated and interpreted qualitatively. Furthermore, Chi-square was conducted regarding the two variables of gender and proficiency. At the end, the results were compared with those of natives in order to explore the socio-pragmatic differences between the two cultures.

Results

This study intended to compare and contrast English natives and Iranian EFL learners' use of suggestion act. Therefore, Iranian non-natives' responses were analyzed upon a suggestion taxonomy by Jiang (2006). Furthermore, since this study was conducted in a foreign context and English natives were not accessible, the data utilized for the natives' frequency was adopted from Jiang (2006) on the basis of T2K-SWAL Corpus. In fact, comparing natives and non-natives, on the basis of Jiang (2006)'s results, frequency and percentage of suggestion samples were probed.

Table 1: Frequency and percentage of suggestion formulas by Natives and Iranian EFL Learners

	Natives Frequency	Percentage	Iranian EFL learners Frequency	percentage
Let's	**213**	**40.8%**	**22**	**1.6%**
Modal	**148**	**28.3%**	**485**	**37.2%**
Wh question	**34**	**6.5%**	**64**	**4.9%**
Conditional	**18**	**3.4%**	**132**	**10.1%**
Performative	**11**	**2.1%**	**64**	**4.9%**
Pseudo cleft	**13**	**2.4%**	**1**	**0.07%**
To clause	**3**	**0.5%**	**229**	**17.5%**
Yes-no question	**0**	**0%**	**68**	**5.2%**
Imperative	**82**	**15.7%**	**237**	**18.2%**

As Table 1 indicates, regarding the type of suggestion strategies, save for "yes-no questions" which were not utilized by natives, both groups employed all the types though they revealed different frequencies. The results are summarized as below:

*English Natives: **Let's > Modal > Imperative** > Wh-question > Conditional > Pseudo cleft > **Performative > To-clause > Yes-no question.***
*Iranian non-natives: **Modals > Imperative > To-clause** > Conditional > Yes-no question > Wh- question> **Performative > Let's > Pseudo cleft.***

As the results indicate, English natives and Iranian non-natives demonstrate different patterns in employment of suggestion samples. The most commonly used strategies in native samples consist of let's (P=40.8%), modals (P=28.3%) and imperatives (P=15.7%). Although modals (P=37.3%) and imperatives (P= 18.3%) share the most common types in the speech of non natives, it should be noted that let's structure (P=1.7%) is among the least commonly used strategies in their suggestions.

Second, regarding the least frequent suggestion strategies, natives employ performatives (P= 2.1%), to-clauses (P= 0.5%) and yes- no questions (P=0%), whereas within non-natives to-clause (P=15.3%) is one of the most frequent strategies and yes-no question (P=7.2%) is frequently utilized as well, though, the perfomative (P=4.6%) strategy shares the same status in nonnative samples. This indicates a cross-linguistic variation between English natives and Iranian EFL learners.

Table 2: Chi- square results of suggestion strategies considering gender

	Observed		Expected N		Df	x^2	Sig
	Male	Female	Male	Female			
Let's	14	8	11.0	11.0	1	1.636	.201
Modal	231	254	242.5	242.5	1	1.091	.296
Wh-question	30	34	32.0	32.0	1	.250	.617
Conditional	60	72	66.0	66.0	1	1.091	.296
Performative	34	30	32.0	32.0	1	.250	.617
Pseudo cleft	2	1	1.5	1.5	1	.333	.564
To clause	122	107	114.5	114.5	1	.983	.322
Yes-no question	25	43	34.0	34.0	1	4.765	.029*
Imperative	141	96	118.5	118.5	1	8.544	.003*

As Table 2 illustrates, both males and females utilized similar types of suggestion strategies. They employed modals, imperatives and to-clauses respectively as the most frequently used strategies and performatives, lets, and pseudo clefts as the least commonly used ones, though they varied in their frequency of each suggestion strategy.

Moreover, regarding the frequencies, males and females showed significant differences with respect to two types of suggestions namely yes-no questions ($x^2 = 4.765, p < .05$) and imperatives ($x^2 = 8.544, p < .05$). Females utilized yes-no questions (N= 43) more often than the expected frequency (N=34), whereas males employed imperative structures more frequently (N=141) than its expected frequency (N= 118.5). Therefore, participants' sex can be considered as a significant factor while making suggestions.

Table 3: Chi- square results of suggestion strategies regarding proficiency level

	Observed N			Expected N	Df	x^2	Sig
	Inter	upper inter	advanced				
Let's	3	7	12	7.3	2	5.545	.062
Modals	177	151	157	161.7	2	2.293	.318
Wh-question	27	19	18	21.3	2	2.281	.320
Conditionals	44	37	51	44.0	2	2.227	.328
Performatives	16	26	22	21.3	2	2.375	.305
Pseudo clefts	1	2	1	1.3	2	.500	.779
To clause	65	78	86	76.3	2	2.943	.230
Yes-no question	23	27	28	26.0	2	.538	.764
Imperatives	57	102	78	79.0	2	12.835	.002*

As Table 3 illustrates, regarding learners' language proficiency, the three groups of intermediate, upper intermediate and advanced learners employed nearly the same types in their suggestion. The most frequent suggestion strategies in speech of three groups were modals, imperatives and to-clauses and the least common strategies involved wh-questions, let's and pseudo clefts and in the case of intermediates performatives were included as well. In contrast to these similarities, Table 3 demonstrates the three groups' variations in their suggestion frequency. Significant difference was revealed in regard to suggestion type of imperatives ($x^2 = 12.835, p < .05$). The highest frequency belongs to the upper intermediate group (N= 102) who utilized imperatives more frequently than the expected frequency (N= 79). As the findings suggest in regard to imperatives a straightforward pattern cannot be observed. Comparing intermediates (N=57) with upper – intermediates, use of imperatives boosts whereas in advanced levels (78) its use decreases.

Discussion

This study intended to explore the similarities and discrepancies between English natives and Iranian EFL learners. Furthermore, it aimed at investigating elaborately Iranian responses considering the two variables of gender and language proficiency.

Regarding the first goal of study, English natives and Persian non-natives revealed both similarities and variations in their suggestion strategies. Both English natives and Iranian EFL learners utilized similar types of strategies. Modals and imperatives were the most common strategies within two groups. Therefore, our study supports Wannaruk (2008) in which the two groups shared most of the speech act strategies. Also, our study findings are in line with Liu and Zhao (2007) who considered modals as one of the most frequent strategies by both natives and EFL learners. This might be related to the pedagogical materials employed in Iran, because English teaching books teach these strategies directly (Jiang, 2006). Additionally, they can be considered as universal forms which are utilized in the Persian language, which can be transferred positively.

As the findings also revealed the two groups were different in some respects: the three most noticeable areas of variations were detected including let's, to-clause and yes-no question strategies. Let's structure was mostly applied by natives, whereas to-clauses and yes-no questions were employed more frequently by Iranian EFL learners. On the basis of studies conducted by Blum -Kulka (1982) and Liu and Zhao (2007), it can be inferred that let's may be respected as a more direct strategy in comparison with to-clauses and yes-no questions which can be employed as indirect suggestion samples. Both out-performance and under-performance of suggestions can be attributed to the cultural values. As Nelson, Carson, Al Batal, and El Bakary (2002, as cited in Allami & Naeimi, 2010) indicate there is a priority for direct and explicit communication in American culture, while Iranians tend to use more implicit communication style. As a matter of fact, the concept of face is crucial in Iranian culture. The difference might be clarified in terms of high and low- context cultures. In a high-context culture such as Iran, people care for more implicit samples rather than explicit ones (Allami & Naeimi, 2010). Therefore, our study findings are in line with Allami and Naeimi (2010) who state a cross-cultural variation between Iranian non-natives and English natives, however, they are in contrast with Liu and Zhao (2007) who indicate non natives' use of more direct strategies in comparison with those of natives.

Kasper (1996, as cited in Jiang, 2006) states learners' lack of appropriate pragmatic competence can be attributed to the insufficient input supplied by pedagogical materials. As Scotton and Bernsten (1988, as cited in Jiang, 2006) indicate there is inconsistency between real life language and textbook language. Since New Interchange book is one of the mostly taught books in Iran, we may analyze briefly suggestion samples available in this book. The book represents patterns such as modals, imperatives, wh-questions, yes-no questions, etc. as suggestion samples, whereas no instance of let's structure is taught in this book (Jiang, 2006). According to T2K-SWAL Corpus (Jiang, 2006), let's structure is one of the most frequent strategies in authentic language. On the other hand, yes- no questions are not much utilized in real discourse, while they are represented as a suggestion form in New Interchange (Jiang, 2006). Thus, it is quite natural that Iranian EFL learners have difficulty in performing a native-like performance while utilizing these two suggestion types due to insufficiency of pedagogical materials. Although presenting pragmatic structures in textbooks is not sufficient to develop an appropriate pragmatic competence. How the materials are presented is also of great importance. In fact, speech act materials are simplified as list of phrases (McCarthy, 1998, as cited in Jiang, 2006). As Koester (2002) states appropriateness is context –dependent not in the form of such phrases which are quite simplified in textbooks. Generally, our study findings supports Sum-hung Li (2010) who indicates the discrepancy between natives and non-natives in their suggestion speech act performances and are in sharp contrast with those of Banerjee and Carrell (1988) and also Liu and Zhao (2007) who reported no significant difference between natives and non-natives.

Regarding the second goal of the study, gender was a significant factor in production of yes- no question and imperative suggestion strategies. Therefore, our study is in line with Banerjee and Carrell (1988) who indicate that gender was a significant factor in production of suggestions. Our findings also are in contrast with those of Bryant Smith (2009), and Allami (2006) who regarded gender as an insignificant factor in nonnatives` production of speech acts. This can be enlightened by the fact that the female language is less forceful and indirect (Crawford, Chaffin, & Glenn, 1983), while that of men is assertive and direct (Lakoff, 1973, 1975, as cited in Crosby & Nyquist, 1997). It seems that males tend to utilize more direct strategies such as imperatives, whereas females employ more indirect suggestions like yes-no questions. Furthermore, the reason why men utilized more imperatives and women employed more yes- no questions can refer to the dominant role of men in conversations, and the cooperative character of women who use more involvement strategies (Tannen, 1990 as cited in Lorenzo-Dus, 2001). Regarding the third goal of study, the three groups of intermediate, upper intermediate and advanced participants varied significantly in regard to imperative suggestion strategy inwhich a straightforward pattern cannot be achieved.

Its least frequency belongs to intermediate learners who used mostly modals and conditionals rather than imperatives, whereas the highest frequency is related to upper intermediate learners. Since imperatives are one of the salient features of suggestion strategy in Persian, our study is in line with Allami and Naimi, (2010) who indicate that upper intermediate learners had the more instances of L1 samples. As a matter of fact, intermediate learners due to insufficient linguistic competence, resort more to prefabricated patterns or some formulaic junks. On the contrary, upper intermediate learners are in the middle of process of constructing their interlanguage, and use their L1 as a linguistic resource to compensate for the existing gap in their interlanguage. In fact, intermediates have memorized chunks or some prefabricated patterns in contrast to upper intermediate learners who are regularly constructing the language samples and hypothesizing their interlanguage. Thus, they transfer more from their L1.

The results recommend several implications: first, emphasizing linguistic competence is not a sufficient path to reach a target-like communicative competence. Great importance needs to be posited on pragmatic competence as well. Second, people of different cultures perceive speech act realization in different ways. Therefore, students' awareness of such cross-cultural pragmatic differences, including both pragmalinguistic ability and sociopragmatic judgment should be attended. (Thomas, 1983 as cited in Sum-hung Li, 2010). Third, the material developers necessitate to include authentic language materials related to daily discourse (Jiang, 2006) embedded in a suitable context rather than list of accurate phrases. Since the study was based on one type of instrument including DCT, the results will be more reliable if other types of pragmatic instruments were utilized such as role plays and multiple choice pragmatic questionnaires . Moreover, other variables can be investigated as well such as: social distance and social power. The age of participants may be attended too.

References

Ahmadian, M.J., & Vahid Dastjerdi, H. (2010). A comparative study of perception of politeness of American reprimands by Iranian EFL learners and Americans. *The* **Social Sciences, 5(4), 177-185.**

Al-Eryani, A.A. (2007). Refusal strategies by Yemeni EFL learners. *Asian EFL Journal*, *9(2)*. 19-34.

Al-Kahtani, S. W. (2005). Refusal realizations in three different cultures: A speech act theoretically-based cross-cultural study. *Journal of King Saud University*, *18*, 35-57.

Allami, H. (2006). A sociopragmatic analysis of griping: The case of Iranian students. *The Linguistic Journal*. *1(1),* 59-76.

Allami, H., & Naeimi, A. (2010). A cross-linguistic study of refusals: An analysis of pragmatic competence development in Iranian EFL learners. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43(1),* 385-406.

Banerjee, J., & Carrell, P.L. (1988). Tuck in your shirt, you squid: Suggestions in ESL. *Language Learning*, *38(3)*, 313–364.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B.A. (1996). Input in an institutional setting. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18,* 171-188.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1982). Learning how to say what you mean in a second language: A study of speech act performance of learners of Hebrew as a second language. *Applied Linguistics,3(1)*, 29-59.

Bryant Smith, J. (2009). The acquisition of pragmatic competence: Complement response strategies in learners of Spanish. A doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University.

Celce-Marcia, M., Dornyei, Z., & Thurre ll, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 6,* 5-35.

Cheng, L. (2009). Indirectness scale in Chinese request speech act. *US-China Foreign Language,7 (10)***,** 51-60.

Cohen, A. D. (1996). Speech acts. In S. L. McKay, & H. N. Hornberger (Eds.), (1996). *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 383-420). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crawford, M., Chaffin, R., & Glenn, J. (1983). Male and female language in a picture-description task. Philadelphia, PA: Paper presented at the Meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association.

Crosby, F., & Nyquist, L. (1977). The female register: An empirical study of Lakoff hypotheses. *Language in Society, 6(3),* 313-322.

Eslami-rasekh, A., Tavakoli, M,. & Abdolrzapour, P. (2010). Certainty and conventional indirectness in Persian and American request forms. *Medwell Journal**, the Social Sciences, 5 (4)*, 332-339.

Eslami-Rasekh, A., & Mardani, M. (2010). Investigating the effects of teaching apology speech act, with a focus on intensifying strategies, on pragmatic development of

EFL learners: The Iranian context. *Journal of Language Society and Culture*, *30,* 96-103.

Felix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2008). Perceptions of refusals to invitations: Exploring the minds of foreign language learners. *Language Awareness*, *17(3)*, 195-211.

Fernandez Guerra, A., & Martinez-flor, A. (2005). Is teaching how to suggest a good Suggestion? An empirical study based on EFL learners' accuracy and appropriateness when making suggestions. *Porta Linguarum*, *5,* 91-108.

Fraser, B. (1983). The domain of pragmatics. In J.C. Richards, & R.W. Schmidt (Eds.), (1983). *Language and Communication* (pp. 29-59). New York: Longman.

Harris, S., Grainger, K., & Mullany, L. (2006). The pragmatics of political apologies. *Discourse & Society, 17*(6), 715-737.

Hudson, T., Detmer, E., & Brown, J.D. (1995). *Developing prototypic measures of crosscultural pragmatics*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Jalilifar, A. (2009). Request strategies: Cross- sectional study of Iranian EFL learners and Australian native speakers. *English Language Teaching*, *2(1)*, 46-61.

Jiang, X. (2006). Suggestions: What should ESL students know? *Elsevier*, *34(1)*, 36-54.

Kasper, G. (1996). Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18(2)*, 149-169.

Karimnia, A., & Afghari, A. (2010). On the applicability of cultural scripts in teaching L2 compliments. *English Language Teaching*, *3(3)*, 71-80.

Koester, A.J. (2002). The performance of speech acts in workplace conversations and the teaching of communicative functions. *System, 30 (2)*, 167-184.

Lakoff, R. (1973). The logic of politeness, or minding your p's and q's. *Chicago Linguistic Society,* 9, 292–305.

Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and women's place*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics.* London: Longman.

Liu, Y., & Zhao, J. (2007). Suggestions in teacher-student conferences**.** *Arizona Working Papers in SLA and Teaching, 14,* 59-74.

Lorenzo-Dus, N. (2001). Compliment responses among British and Spanish university students: A contrastive study. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33(1),*107-127.

Martinez-Flor, A. (2005). A theoretical review of the speech act of suggesting: Towards taxonomy for its use in FLT. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, *18*, 167-187.

Martinez-Flor, A. (2006). Task effects on EFL learners' production of suggestions: A focus on elicited phone messages and Emails. *Journal of English and American Studies, 33,* 47-64.

Martinez-Flor,A., & Alcon Soler, E.(2004). Developing pragmatic awareness of suggestions in the EFL classroom. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10 (1*), 47-76.

Martinez-Flor, A., & Fukuya, Y. J. (2005). The effects of instruction on learners' production of appropriate and accurate suggestions. *System*, *33(3),* 463-480.

Martinez-Flor, A., & Uso-Juan, E. (2006). Pragmatic development in a second or foreign language: Some classroom techniques. *Greta,* 50-56.

Matsumura, Sh. (2001). Learning the rules for offering advice: A quantitative approach to second language socialization. *Language Learning, 51(4)*, 635-679.

McCarthy, M.J. (1998). *Spoken language and applied linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meijers, A. (2007). Collective speech acts. *Theory and Decision Library, 41(1),* 93-110.

Nelson, G.L., Carson, J., Al Batal, M., & El Bakary, W. (2002). Cross-cultural pragmatics: Strategy use in Egyptian Arabic and American English refusals. *Applied Linguistics, 23(2)*, 163-189.

Nguyen, TH.M. (2007). Modifying L2 criticisms: How learners do it?. *Journal of Pragmatics, 40 (4)*, 768-791.

Parvaresh, V., & Eslami Rasekh, A. (2009). Speech act disagreement among young women inIran. *Comparative Literature and Culture, 11(4)*, 2-8.

Pishghadam, R,. & Norouz Kermanshahi, P. (2011). Speech act of correction: The way Iranian EFL learners correct their teachers. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *1(4)*, 342-348.

Salmani- Nodoushan, M. A. (2007). Conversational strategies in Farsi complaints: The case of Iranian complainees. *Phin, 39*, 20-36.

Schmidt, R. W., & Richards, J. C. (1980). Speech acts and second language Learning. *Applied linguistics*, *1(2)*, 129-157.

Scotton, C.M., & Bernsten, J. (1988). Natural conversations as a model for textbook dialogue. *Applied Linguistics, 9(4),* 372-384.

Searle, J. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society, 5(1),* 1-23.

Sharifian, F. (2005). The Persian cultural schema of "shekasteh-nafsi": A study of compliment responses in Persian and Anglo-Australian speakers. *Pragmatics and cognition, 13(2)*, 337-362.

Sharifian, F. (2008). Cultural schemas in L1 and   L2 compliment responses: A study of Persian-speaking learners of English. *Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour, Culture, 4 (1)*, 55-80.

Sum-hung Li, E. (2010). Making suggestions: A contrastive study of young Hong Kong and   Australian students. *Journal of Pragmatics, 42(3)*, 598-616.

Taguchi, N. (2006). Analysis of appropriateness in a speech act of request in L2 English.   *Pragmatics, 16(4),* 513-533.

Tanck, S. (2002). Speech act sets of refusal and complaint: A comparison of native and non-native English speakers' production. *TESOL Working Papers, 4 (2),* 1-22.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics, 4(2)*, 91-112.

Uso-Juan, E., & Martinez-Flor, A. (2008). Teaching learners to appropriately mitigate requests. *Babel-Afial, 17*, 253-270.

Wannaruk, A. (2008). Pragmatic transfer in Thai EFL refusals. *RELC, 39(3)*, 318-337.

Wolfson, N. (1981). Compliments in cross-cultural perspective. *TESOL Quarterly, 15(2),*117-124.

Appendix

Please complete the information required in the next part.
Sex: male□ female□   Native language:
Nationality: Age:

Which level are you studying? Beginner □   Elementary □   Intermediate □
 Upper intermediate□   Advanced □

How many years have you studied English in classes?
 Have you studied English outside of English classes? If yes, please describe:
Telephone No:
E-mail address:

1. You and one of your English teachers meet in a bookstore. He/she is considering buying an expensive book about English vocabulary learning. However, you have seen the book in another bookstore at a lower price. What would you suggest your teacher?

   Teacher: This   book   contains   useful   points   and   of   course   it   is   expensive.
   You:…………………………………………………………....…..
   ....

2. Your sister/brother's friend (younger than you) would like to contact people from other countries in order to know other customs and be able to practice the English language. You think that chatting on the internet is a very good and fast way of meeting people from all over the world. What would you suggest her?

   Sister/brother's friend: but I did not discover an appropriate way to contact people from other countries.
   You:…………………………………………………………....…..
   ....

3. You see one of your new classmates working in the library very late in the evening. She/he is searching the Internet in order to prepare a lecture and looks very tired. What would you suggest to this classmate?

   Classmate: I am so tired since, I've been working all day.
   You:…………………………………………………………....…..
   ....

4. You're at the grocery store with your neighbor. He/she is about to buy some potato chips which are on sale. You notice that the expiration date is September 2010; this is November 2011. What would you suggest him/her?

   Neighbor: I need some of those potato chips on the sale, please.
   You:…………………………………………………………....…..
   ....

5. You arrive home and would understand that your father is planning to drive to a city that evening. You have just heard the weather forecast and know that six inches of snow and freezing rain are predicted for that city. What would you suggest him?

   Father: I am going to drive there this evening.

   You:…………………………………………………………....…..
   ....

6. You go to the candy store and buy some delicious looking candy. You are very disappointed when you taste it because it tastes terrible. A little girl whom you don't know comes to buy some of them. What would you suggest her?
   Girl: What delicious looking candy!
   You:…………………………………………………………....…..
   ....