A Case Study of Requests in English Emails of Iraqi Arab University Students in North Cyprus

Ghazwan Mutar Ahmed Aljanabi

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
English Language Teaching

Eastern Mediterranean University
June 2016
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

———————————————
Prof. Dr. Cem Tanova
Acting Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in English Language Teaching.

———————————————
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibilyev
Chair, Department of English Language Teaching

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in English language Teaching.

———————————————
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibilyev
Supervisor

Examining Committee

1. Prof. Dr. Necdet Osam	———————————————
2. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibilyev	———————————————
3. Asst. Prof. Dr. Fatoş Erozan	———————————————

ABSTRACT

The present study aimed to identify the pragmatics of politeness with reference to the head act of email request strategies used by the Iraqi postgraduate students in an academic setting at Eastern Mediterranean University, Near East University, Cyprus International University and Girne American University in theTurkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). Two research questions were asked. The first aimed to investigate the strategies preferred by Iraqi post-graduate students while performing requests in e-mails, whereas the second aimed to find out the role of learners' native language transfer in performing requests.

The research was conducted as a qualitative and a quantitive case study.Discourse Completion Test (DCT) was used to collect data from three different groups; namely, Iraqi postgraduate students (IPGSs) as the research group, and British-English native speakers (BENSs) and Iraqi-Arab native speakers (IANSs), both representing the baseline groups.This completion task mainly focused on student-professor email request communication.

The findings of the study showed that both IPGS and BENS groups preferred to use the conventionally indirect strategies to request in emails. The results pointed out that the IPGS performedrequestsin using formulations different from the baseline group BENS. This indicated that they didn't do same as the target or native pragmatic norms all the time, but they were engaged in the creative construction process in interlanguage pragmatic development .

In light of the result, such study involves pedagogical implications that point of the need of Iraqi English teachers to improve their students' level of pragmatic competence in order to avoid pragmatic failure in email communication, especially in request strategy. Finally, the present study grants other useful areas for more investigation by focusing on the natural data of request strategy performed by EFL learners that may cause pragmatic transfer.

Keywords:Pragmatic variations, Pragmatic transfer,Linguistic politeness strategy, Interlanguage pragmatics.

ÖZ

Bu çalışma Kuzey Kıbrıs Türk Cumhuriyeti'nde (KKTC) DAÜ, YDÜ, UKÜ ve GAÜ bünyesindeki Iraklı Arap yüksek lisans üniversite öğrencileri tarafından kurumsal e-posta iletişiminin esas dilsel nezaket stratejisini incelemektedir. Araştırma iki soruyu inceler. İlk olarak Iraklı yüksek lisans öğrencilerinin e-postalarında ricada bulunurken kullandıkları stratejiler, ikinci olarak ise rica ederken öğrencilerin ana dil transferlerinin rolünü öğrenmeyi amaçlamıştır.

Araştırma, niteliksel ve sayısal bir vaka çalışması olarak sürdürülmüştür. Veriler üç farklı gruptan Söylem Tamamlama Testi (STT) kullanılarak toplanmıştır; şöyle ki, araştırma grubu olarak Iraklı yüksek lisans öğrencileri (IPGSs), referans grupları olarak da anadili Britanya-İngilizcesi olan kişileri (BENSs) ve anadili Irak-Arapçası (IANSs) olan kişileri içermektedir. Bu tamamlama çalışması ağırlıklı olarak öğrenci-profesör e-posta istek taleplerindeki iletişime odaklanmaktadır.

Çalışmanın bulguları hem IPGS hem de BENS gruplarının e-postalarında ricada bulunmak için geleneksel dolaylı stratejiler kullanmayı tercih ettiğini gösterdi. Sonuçlar gösterdi ki IPGS grubu referans grubu olan BENS grubundan farklı formülasyonları kullanarak ricada bulundu. Bu onların hedef veya anadildeki pragmatik normları her zaman ayni şekilde kullanmadıklarını gösterdi, ancak dillerarası pragmatik gelişim açısından yaratıcı oluşturma sürecinde bulundular.

Sonuçlar ışığında, böyle bir çalışma Iraklı İngilizce öğretmenlerinin öğrencilerinin e-posta iletişiminde, özellikle de ricada bulunma stratejisinde, pragmatik bir başarısızlık yaşamamaları amacı ile öğrencilerinin pragmatik yeterliliklerini geliştirmeleri gerektiğine yönelik pedagojik öneriler içermektedir. Son olarak, bu çalışma yabancı dil olarak İngilizce (EFL) öğrencilerinin gerçekleştirdiği pragmatik iletmeye sebep olabilecekricada bulunma stratejilerindeki genel verilere odaklanarak diğer faydalı alanlarda daha fazla araştırma yapılmasını sağlayacaktır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Pragmatik varyasyonlar, Pragmatik transfer, Dilsel nezaket stratejileri, Ortak dil pragmatiği

ACKNOWELDGMENT

First , I would like to thank Allah for his help throughout my life. I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibliyev for his supervision, advice, and guidance from the very early stage of this thesis as well as I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to all my jury members, Prof. Dr. Necdet Osam, Asst. Prof. Dr. Fatoş Erozan, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ali Sidki Agazade, and Assist. Prof. Dr. Ilkay Gilanlioglu for all their advice and encouragement.

 My thanks also go to my friends who helped and encouraged me during the period of my studies Dr.Mohamed, Mr.Ahmed Alani, Mr. Mohammed Talib and Mr. Mohammed Khalid. I also wish to acknowledge the cooperation from postgraduate students of Iraq for this study. I am further grateful to all participants for sincerely answering questionnaires. Finally, I would like to dedicate this thesis to my father and mother, who has made sacrifices to give me an opportunity to finish writing this thesis. their unfailing love, understanding and support over time and distance certainly helped me to endure the difficult times away from home .

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, everyday communication has been influenced by technological changes so that new electrically intervened means of interaction have been brought forward. Therefore, computer-mediated communication has emerged as a subfield of computer-mediated discourse (Herring 2003), which investigates how speakers from different language backgrounds and settings interact in synchronous and asynchronous communication in academic settings. For example, e-mail communication has become an accepted asynchronous medium of interaction and has substituted some of the traditional face-to-face formulas of interaction. It has also become part of the daily routine because of its high transmission speed and less intrusive nature, especially in academic settings.

Consequently, it is categorized by merged features of the conversational language and written the language. Being a unique fusion type of text, email allows its users to freely employ a wide range of discourse styles, which may lead to misunderstanding in communication because of different target language competency among students that is used in different contexts for various communicative purposes.

Accordingly, writing email requests to professors has become as an essential means of academic environment for most students within international universities despite having difficulty in undertaking and handling the e-mails, therefore the students are

often unfamiliar with the expectations of academic email, particularly new candidates to university, who are mostly non-native speakersIraqi post-graduate students studying (IPGS) abroad are an example of such a situation in which Iraqi students are exposed to difficulty in academic email communication. Such communication may mostly involve requesting and asking for appointment or registration.

This study attempted to take e-mail request in student-teacher communication as a case in point so as to find out which request strategies of these students are preferred in request patterns. Moreover, the study seeks to find an evidence of the presence of pragmatic transfer, which may lead to the pragmatic failure in cross-cultural communication within an academic context.

1.1 Background of the Study

In the past few decades, advances in communication technologies and computer sciences, particularly with respect to the Internet and its ever-growing global coverage, have dramatically increased communication in English its speakers and users (native and non-native) all around the world. With the availability of technology, most people have taken part in communicating with other people from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds in different settings including academia. Therefore, it can be noted over here that while until recently most encounters NSs and NNSs were limited to visits to one another's country, meetings at international settings, or through correspondence via post. The digital revolution and the advent of email, voice and chat applications, social networks, and other instantaneous communicative means, have made communication between individuals and groups even easier and faster to the extent that it is right now considered an everyday fact of

life. But instructors can easily contact their students and other colleagues as regards academic concerns, so can students send emails to their colleagues or instructors to accomplish certain communicative functions that could mostly include making requests or asking for information.

But what is significant to mention here is that with every communication, there is a risk for misunderstanding, which could happen from inappropriate use of email requests, especially in the case of students' non-native English backgrounds. So, they may have such difficulty by using the appropriate language strategies when communicating in the target language TL (i.e. English) as they cannot express themselves and convey the message they want to send using words and sentences that pragmatically match the social and academic context (Kasper and Blum-Kulka, 1993). It is for this reason most NNS students are exposed to pragmatic failure as their pragmatic competences usually behind their linguistic competence (Bardovi-Harlig & Dornye, 1998; Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993).

In light of these developments, it is clearly noted that there is a compelling need for developing comprehensive TL pragmatic competence for learners, which raises their awareness of how to use words and sentences appropriately without pragmatic failure in order to accomplish the communicative function and achieve the intended aim. It is in this way, the students are enabled to use language appropriately in different academic contexts and communicate easily. Specifically, Iraqi students who are studyingabroad isan example of such NNS students who are often exposed the difficulty of making polite and appropriate requests in academic settings.

Therefore, this study address interlanguage pragmatics as it deals with non-native speakers' use of linguistic patterns (Kasper and Blum-Kulka, 1993). It seeks to

investigate how Iraqi post-graduate students make requests while communicating via emails with their professors and instructors in a university context. It also aims to identify the linguistic strategies that these students use in their requests and find out an evidence of pragmatic transfer from their mother tongue (i.e. Arabic) as their responses to written email requests are compared with other responses taken from NSs as baseline data.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Misconceptions during cross-cultural communication between native and non-native English native speakers and have been the subject of numerous studies (Marriot, 1995; Miller, 1995; Thomas, 1987), which usually make a distinction between two sources of misunderstanding at a syntactic level and at a pragmatic level. Difficulties arising at the syntactic level such as using incorrect words, verb forms or wrong tense, do not constitute a major source of misunderstanding and are often regarded as mistakes. Surprisingly, studies present that interlocutors often make light of these mistakes and try to accommodate to these types of difficulties by speaking more slowly.

In contrast, the most problematic miscommunications occur at the pragmatic level where perceptions of appropriateness in email communications from one specific culture to another are different. Specifically, the problem usually takes place when the request email message seems clear but the pragmatic notion of the message is not, leading to pragmatic failure which is caused by different cross-cultural conceptualizations and understandings of a given activity or event. Thomas (1987) uses the term sociopragmatic failure to refer to this type of miscommunication.

The ambiguity found in the emails pragmatic notion may be resulted in the non-native speakers' limited pragmatic competence that makes students handicapped to use the appropriate linguistic strategies (i.e. words, verb forms, modifiers, verb tense, sentences, etc.) in the appropriate social context, bearing in mind people's norms, traditions, backgrounds, social class, etc. Accordingly, most non-native English speaking people in academic contexts (i.e. students) may be exposed to this pragmatic failure at both syntactic and pragmatic levels while communicating with their professors and instructors, for example. This failure could be clearer in the students' communication via emails when they contact their professors in a written from requesting or asking for permissions or information. Interestingly, NNS Iraqi students tend to have the same difficulty when they use email to contact their university professors and make requests which carry the most part of a teacher-student communication.

Making a request in EFL Arab contexts has addressed this phenomenon and sought to show the semantic and syntactic formula of requests made by Arabic and native speakers of English (Al-Ammar 2000; Al-Eryani, 2007; El-Shaszly 1993; Umar, 2004). Th findings have demonstrated that English native speakers used more semantic and syntactic modifiers than their Arabic counterparts (Umar, 2004). The research has also addressed how Arab students of English were closer to regress on their cultural background when performing requests and formulating their request strategies, even at advanced language proficiency levels.

The findings of the current study as it may give a clear path of investigating Arab context where Iraqi postgraduate students have difficulty in making requests in another communication channel (i.e. email communication) that is different from

face-face-communication. In this communication type, the chance of identifying the respondents' preferred linguistic strategies to requests is even greater as students communicate respond to emails in a written from; a thing which makes it easier to handle the strategy choice. To this end, such study concerns itself with exploring the preferred request strategies used by Iraqi postgraduate students in an academic setting (student-teacher email communication), aiming at the same time to identify the level of directness of request strategies that the Iraqi students use in the process of requesting and comparing with other baseline groups.

The results of this study may be helpful in solving Iraqi Arab students and other international students mistakes in terms of pragmatic level and linguistic strategies of requests. As their awareness of how the first language of students' impact on their requests and the strategies they use is raised, this may add credit to their pragmatic proficiency and competence to know and follow the rules of politeness and appropriateness when fulfilling a request function/ speech act in a language that is not theirs. They may become cautious in using words, sentences, tenses, etc. as they know what to communicate, when, how, with whom, and with what extent of severity and suitability.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to identify the extent to which Iraqi post–graduate students use their L1 or L2 in terms of request strategies and pragmatic level of requests, while communicating with their professors via emails based on five different academic situations. In particular, this study seeks to identify the extent to which the interlanguage IL group (IPGS) prefers the head act of request strategy. As

their responses are evaluated and compared with baseline groups, the patterns of the request speech act in the given academic situations might be clearly realized.

Furthermore, the study purposes to find out the extent to which the L1 pragmatic knowledge has a positive or negative impact on performing request emails. In the case of Iraqi post-graduate students, misunderstandings may occur when they transfer their L1 strategies to the L2, so the appropriateness of their requests may then be misunderstood or unacceptable to others since Iraqi graduate students, even at advanced levels, tend to return to their L1 cultural background while performing requests email.

This phenomenon arises because speakers from different cultures hold differing degrees of politeness. In an attempt to investigate intercultural communication and the intervention of meaning in email interaction, this thesis is likely to reveal the potential ability for using email to knowledge culture as a process of meaning negotiation and construction and has relevance to teachers of EFL in Arab countries and other language teaching contexts.

1.4 The Research Questions

1-What arethe request strategies preferred by Iraqi Arab postgraduate students when performing the speech act of request email?

2-What is the role of learners' native language transfer in performing the speech act of request email?

1.5 Significance of the Study

The significance of this study can be seen in the sense that it seeks to reveal that Iraqipostgraduate students, indeed even at advanced levels, might substitute their

source language with target language while performing the email request. Following this, mostIraqi Arab post-graduate students do not seem to be aware enough of the pragmatic differences between Arabic and English, clearly because the appropriate Arabic request scheme in a given situation might not be appropriate in English in the same situation.

Specifically, the study emphasis on the head acts of request strategies as used in university students' emails to their respective teachers. Accordingly, the study involves composing representative situations of emails written by Iraqi Arab university students in five academic contexts in Northern Cyprus. The collected data will be analyzed and compared against the learners' L1 in terms of the linguistic politeness strategy,and pragmatic variation knowledge (pragmatic transfer), which may be having a positive or negative effect on the utilization of requests.

The researcher hopes that the findings of this study will further enhance Iraqi Arab students' pragmatic awareness particularly with respect to their use of request strategies in the TL, helping them to minimize the errors that could lead to miscommunication. Furthermore, the findings that would also assist as an indication for English teachers in teaching request strategies in EFL/ESL contexts. In general, to the extent that it may help in developing an appropriate request behavior similar to that used by English speakers. The findings would also be of great help to any research work was undertaken in future and materials development that is better suited to Iraq Arab students. With emails being a major medium of communication in academic settings, the contribution of this study to raising Arab students' sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic awareness would be an advantage to develop the learning and teaching of pragmatics in EFL contexts.

1.6 Definition of Terms

Speech acts: The term speech act has been defined as a minimal unit of discourse (Searle, 1969), a basic and functional unit of communication (Cohen, 1996). Examples of speech acts include giving and responding to compliments, making requests, apologizing, and refusals.

Pragmatic competence: Pragmatic competence (PC) is the ability to use language effectively in order to achieve a specific purpose and to understand the language in context. According to Bachman (1990:89), pragmatic competence involves the knowledge of the linguistic resources required to realize a speech act and of sociocultural constraints, which govern the use of these linguistic resources.

Pragmatic failure: Pragmatic failure refers to the inability to understand which is meant by what is said (Thomas, 1983, p. 91).

Pragmalinguistic competence: Pragmalinguistic competence refers to the use of appropriate language to accomplish a speech act. (Thomas, 1983: 95).

Sociopragmatic competence: It is the appropriateness of a speech act in a particular context (Thomas, 1983: 94).

Semantic formula: A semantic formula refers to a word, phrase, or sentence that meets a particular semantic criterion or strategy; any one or more of these can be used to perform the act in question (Cohen, 1996, p. 265).

Discourse Completion Task: A Discourse-Completion Task (DCT) is a tool used in linguistics and pragmatics to elicit particular speech acts. A DCT consists of a one-sided role-play containing a situational prompt, which a participant will read to elicit the responses of another participant.

Communicative competence: Communicative competence is a term coined by Dell Hymes in 1966 in reaction to Noam Chomsky's (1965:61) notion of "linguistic

competence". Communicative competence is the intuitive functional knowledge and control of the principles of language usage. Hymes (1972:34) sees communicative competence as consisting of four components, relating to linguistic grammaticality, psychological feasibility, sociological appropriacy, and attested ness.

Cooperative Principles: The cooperative principle is a principle of conversation that was proposed by Grice 1975, stating that participants expect that each will make a "conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange."

Locutionary act: It is saying something (the location) with a certain meaning in the traditional sense. e.g. He said to me ' Shoot her!' meaning by 'shoot' shoot and referring by 'her ' to her. John Searle (1969:78)

Illocutionary act: It is the act performed in saying something, i.e. the act named and identified by the explicit performative verb. John Searle (1969) e.g. He urged (or advised, ordered, etc.) me to shoot her.

Perlocutionary meaning: It is the act performed by, or as a consequence of, saying something. John Searle (1969).

1.7 Summary

This introductory chapter sought to conceptualize the current study in terms of its context, background, and general and specific purposes. It has also clearly stated its problem statement in a way that urges constant intervention and investigation of a context like Iraq where learners' pragmatic knowledge (i.e. competence) seems to lag behind their linguistic competence. Showing this compelling need for such intervention has made it highly significant to all stakeholders involved in English language instruction (i.e. learners, teachers, authoritative bodies, educators, materials

writers, syllabus designers, local researchers, etc.) as it will hopefully contribute to the whole local community of practice.

Contextualization the study of this way helps plan for and identify the major theoretical and practical concerns that will help get the research carried out as governed by its contextual specifics and its procedural definition of terms. In other words, this has simply paved the way towards handling the study in terms of how it will be theoretically modeled and practically conducted in the following two chapters; namely, Literature Review and Methodology.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter provides a general review of the literature focusing on the requested speech acts as demonstrated in the emails of Iraqi Arab post-graduate students. It starts with sketching the scenario on the most influential pragmatics-related issues that involve pragmatic competence, pragmatic awareness, pragmatic transfer, interlanguage pragmatics, sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistics. It then formulates its reference to Speech Act Theory, Politeness Theory, Cooperative Principle and requests as one of the most commonly-used speech act, all of which help examine the relationship between requests and politeness as used in EFL contexts. The chapter also looks at interlanguage studies. Finally, review request email communication across –cultural pragmatic studies through highlighted in different studies by identifying request email communication performed by different nationalities.

2.1 Pragmatic Competence

Writing emails to an authority character, such as a university lecturer, supervisor or coordinator it can be considered as one of the duties that entails high awareness of politeness strategies and pragmatic competence and email communication that need to be followed.Pragmatic competence (PC) plays an important role in the production and perception of language. Defined as the "study of language from the view point of users" (Crystal, 1985: 240), pragmatic competence is one of the major factors in the communication process. The pragmatic competence is totally distinctive from grammatical competence, which is not adequate so as to be competent in pragmatics

although it can be a main complaint for gaining the pragmatic competence (Bardovi-Harlig, 1999). Pragmatic competence is one of the main aspects in the process of communication.

Fraser (2010), defines pragmatic competence as "the ability to communicate your intended message with all its distinctions in any socio-cultural context and to interpret the message of your interlocutor as it was intended" (p. 15). However critical PC is for communication succsss, Fraser maintains that PC is often not adequately emphasized in second language instruction, resulting in second language speakers who make grammatically acceptable utterances but are equally unsuccessful in achieving the communicative goals. According to, the way interlocutors produce and perceive speech in different situations may cause uttering of inappropriate utterances, which may lead to misunderstanding and miscommunication.

ESL/EFL learners' inadequate pragmatic competence of the target language has been frequently studied (Rahimi Domakani et al, 2014; Tagashira, Yamato, and Isoda, 2011; Eslami, 2010) and recognized as the learners' failure to communicate successfully with native speakers of English, which often results in intercultural miscommunication. One of the main causes that lead to pragmatic errors made by EFL/ESL speakers is negative pragmatic transfer which is defined as the use of L1 pragmatic features that lead to inappropriate forms in the target language and the subsequent miscommunication (Atashaneh and Izadi, 2011). It is worth mentioning that native speakers' reactions to non-native speakers' errors vary depending on the nature and type of errors NNSs make. While NSs tend to ignore phonological, syntactic, and lexical errors and often accommodate their speech to that of the NNSs, they are sensitive to pragmatic errors (Hassani, Mardani, and Hossein, 2011).

Development of L2 pragmatic competence has been the focus of various theoretical and methodological perspectives investigating the relationships among pragmatics, grammar, and L2 proficiency (e.g. Bardovi-Hardig, 2000, 2001; Takahashi, 1996, 2001, 2005). In this regard, there are two apparently opposing hypotheses with respect to development of grammar and pragmatics (Kasper and Rose, 2002): (1) grammar precedes pragmatics and (2) pragmatics precedes grammar. While the proponents of both hypotheses provide evidence in support of their respective view, the two contradicting hypotheses clearly point out to the non-linear development of grammar and pragmatics. Accordingly, it may not be uncommon to see that highly proficient L2 learners lack a corresponding degree of pragmatic competence or fail to demonstrate a high level of syntactic complexity in their pragmatic production. To cite an example, Takahashi (1996, 2001) showed that Japanese EFL learners showed a preference for mono-clausal request formulations such as *Please* or *Will/Would you* to bi-clausal formulations such as *I was wondering if you could* regardless of proficiency.

2.2 Pragmatic Awareness

Research into the pragmatic competence of second language learners has demonstrated that grammatical competence and pragmatic development do not occur at the same rate and the former does not guarantee a corresponding level of the latter (Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei, 1997). This asynchronous development raises the question whether learners need to be taught pragmatics. Although it is tempting to feel that pragmatic knowledge develops alongside syntactic and lexical competence, research into the pragmatic development of adult foreign and second language learners has clearly shown that the pragmatics of NSs and that of NNSs are quite different (Kasper, 1997). Others have also reported that even advanced language

learners' communicative acts are not free from frequent pragmatic errors (Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper, 1989). This inadequate knowledge of pragmatics calls for L2 instruction to take into account learners' pragmatic development in the target language. Importantly, researchers in this area have generally confirmed the positive impact of instruction on raising learners' pragmatic awareness (Kasper, 1997).

Eslami-Rasekh (2005) proposes a number of activities aimed at developing learners' pragmatic competence. She divides these activities into two main types: pragmatic awareness-raising activities, and activities offering opportunities for communicative practice (Kapser, 1997). The role of instruction on learners' awareness and production of speech acts has fascinated researchers in the field of ILP. In addition, results of studies dealing with the effect of instruction also seem to provide evidence on the superiority of explicit over implicit pragmatic intervention (see Takahashi, 2010, for a review of the effect of pragmatic instruction on speech act performance).

2.3 Pragmatic Transfer

It has been proposed that pragmatic knowledge from the first language exerts an influence on the use and acquisition of pragmatic knowledge in the second language (Beebe et al., 1990; Kasper, 1992; Odlin, 1989; Wolfson, 1989). According to Kasper (1992), pragmatic transfer is a major factor in shaping NNSs' pragmatic knowledge and performance. The literature on pragmatic transfer has abundantly demonstrated that transfer exists at the pragmatic level(Kasper & Rose, 1999). Beebe and Takaskashi (1987) proposed the assumption that learners' L2 proficiency was relatedwith pragmatic transfer, but theirresearch failed to prove that(cited in Takaskashi, 1996). Some other researchers, on the other hand, attempted to explain this by attributing pragmatic transfer to learners' limited L2 knowledge which makes

transfer of their L1 conventions inevitable. While pragmatic transfer is an important phenomenon in ILP, it is not the only factor that influences the learning process. Olshtain (1983) and Robinson (1992) reported that learners tendedto transfer their L1 knowledge when they obtain a Universalistview as opposed to a relativist perspective on pragmatic norms(cited in Kasper& Rose, 1999).

Additionally, Takaskashi (1996) claimed learners' transferability interacted with the degree of different requestive goal. She also stated the EFL class did not provide enough opportunities for developing pragmalinguistic awareness in L2.EFL classes usually focus on promoting learner's grammar proficiency, and neglect to provide the pragmatics knowledge. This is common phenomenon since they have limited time and teaching resources, and they have to pass the English tests which usually irrelative withthe pragmatics knowledge.

Kasper (1992) recognizes two types of pragmatic transfer: positive and negative. In Kasper's view, positive pragmatic transfer takes place when L1 and L2 share language specific conventions. Therefore, in this situation pragmatic transfer plays a facilitative role by allowing learners to successfully convey their message in the target language. In contrast, negative pragmatic transfer occurs when learners resort to their L1 sociocultural norms, which are not shared by the target language. It is here that pragmatic failure takes place since the H (hearer) perceives the force of the S's (speaker's) utterance as other than intended by the S.

2.4 Interlanguage Pragmatics (ILP)

For the past decades, interlanguage pragmatics (henceforth, ILP) research has mainly focused on native/nonnativeproductions of a particular pragmatic feature in a given

social context. These studies have produced considerable contributionsto our understanding of ILP, but it has become necessary for ILP researchers to "go beyond the common practice ofanalyzing L2 speakers' competence merely on the basis of performance data" (Kormos, 1998, p. 354) and to investigate L2speakers' cognitive processes.

Kasper (1996) defines interlanguage pragmatics as the "study of non-native speaker's use and acquisition of L2 pragmatic knowledge" (p. 145). Interlanguage pragmatics is concerned with how non-native speakers understand and perform linguistic action in a target language as well as how they acquire pragmatic knowledge of L2. The study of interlanguage pragmatics has caught the attention of SLA researchers in recent years as it is observed that even highly proficient L2 learners make mistakes in the target language due to an inadequate pragmatic knowledge. Remarkably, research shows that L2 learners are more likely to be judged by their pragmatic mistakes than their linguistic mistakes by their target language interlocutors (Blum-Kulka, 1997).

The main focus of ILP is on speech acts or linguistic action. This has promoted my researchers to criticize ILP and argue that it has mostly focused on the comparison of the differences between L2 learners' production of speech acts and that of native speakers at the expense of pay little attention to the developmental process of the acquisition of ILP (Bardovi-Harlig, 1996; Kasper, 1992; Kasper & Schmidt, 1996; Kasper & Rose, 2002; Daives & Tyler, 2005). To study speech acts, ILP focuses on the evidence of pragmatic transfer by comparing three sets of data: (1) the baseline data from native speakers of the learners' native language, (2) the interlanguage data, and (3) the target language baseline data from native speakers of the TL (Kasper,

1992, p. 223). (Woodfield, 2010).And the reason behind their productions (Gass & Mackey, 2000). To date, however, only a handful of ILP studies have examined what learners are thinking during and/or after performing a given pragmatic task (e.g., Cohen &Olshtain, 1993; Felix-Brasdefer, 2008; Hassall, 2008; Ren, 2012; Robinson, 1992; Woodfield, 2010; 2012).

2.4.1 Sociopragmatics

Sociopragmatics was described by Leech (1983, p. 10) as "sociological interface of pragmatics", which basically refers to the social perceptions underlying speakers' interpretation and performance of communicative action. In different speech communities, the assessment of speaker's and hearer's social distance and social power, their rights and obligations, and the degree of imposition involved in particular communicative acts differs (Takahashi & Beebe, 1993; Blum-Kulka & House, 1989; Olshtain, 1989). The values of context factors are negotiable; they can change through the dynamics of conversational interaction, as captured in Fraser's (1990) notion of the 'conversational contract' and in Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model (1993).

2.4.2 Pragmalinguistics

Kasper and Rose (2001), define pragmalinguistics as the linguistic resources available for conveying communicative acts and performing pragmatic functions. In their opinion, these resources include pragmatic strategies such as directness, indirectness, routines, a wide range of linguistic forms used to intensify or soften communicative acts. Kasper and Roever (2005) believe that the focus of pragmalinguistics is the intersection of pragmatics and linguistic forms, which jointly make up the speaker's knowledge and ability to use form and meaning conventions in a communicative act. Dippold (2008) refers to pragmalinguistic competence as

knowledge of forms and strategies to convey particular illocutions, distinguishing it from sociopragmatic competence, which involves knowledge of use of these forms and strategies in an appropriate context.

2.5 Speech Act Theory

Speech act theory endeavor to show how speakers employ language to achieve purposed actions and how hearers concludepurposed meaning form what is said. though speech act studies are now regarded a sub-discipline of cross-cultural pragmatics, they infact take their basis in the philosophy of language.Scholars like Austin (1962), Grice (1975), and Searle (1965, 1969, 1975) offered basic insight into this new theory of linguistic communication based on the assumption that the minimal units of human communication are not linguistic expressions, but rather the performance of certain kinds of acts, such as making statements, asking questions, giving directions, " (Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper, 1989, p.2). Austin (1962) characterizesthe performance of uttering words with a consequential purpose as "the performance of a locutionary act, and the study of utterances thus far and in these respects the study of locutions, or of the full units of speech" (p. 69).

These units of speech are not tokens of the symbol or word or sentence but rather units of linguistic communication and it is "the production of the token in the performance of the speech act that constitutes the basic unit of linguistic communication" (Searle, 1965, p.136). According to Austin's theory, these functional units of communication have prepositional or locutionary meaning (the literal meaning of the utterance), illocutionary meaning (the social function of the utterance), and perlocutionary force (the effect produced by the utterance in a given context) (Cohen, 1996, p. 384).

Speech acts have been claimed by some to operate by universal pragmatic principles (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969, 1975; Brown & Levinson, 1978). Others have shown them to vary in conceptualization and verbalization across cultures and languages (Lee-Wong, 1994; Wierzbicka, 1985). Although this debate has generated over three decades of research, only the last 15 years marked a shift from an intuitively based approach to an empirically based one, which "has focused on the perception and production of speech acts by learners of a second or foreign language (in the most cases, English as a second or foreign language, i.e., ESL and EFL) at varying stages of language proficiency and in different social interactions" (Cohen, 1996, p. 385).

Blum Kulka et. al., (1989) argue that there is a strong need to complement theoretical studies of speech acts with empirical studies, based on speech acts produced by native speakers of individual languages in strictly defined contexts.The illocutionary decisions grasped by individual languages reflect what Gumperz (1982) calls "social rationale" (pp. 182-185). Consider the accompanying entry: The way that two speakers whose sentences are entirely syntactic can contrast profoundly in their elucidation of one another's verbal procedures shows that conversational administration rests on phonetic information. In any case, to discover what that information is we should surrender the current perspectives of correspondence, which draw an essential refinement between social or social learning from one viewpoint and semantic flagging procedures on the other. (pp. 185-186)

Contrasts in "social rationale" typified in individual languages include the usage of different phonetic instruments. As various studies have demonstrated, these components are fairly culture-particular and might bring about breakdowns in between ethnic correspondence. Such correspondence breakdowns are to a great

extent because of a language exchange at the sociocultural level where social contrasts have impact in selecting among the potential procedures for understanding a given discourse act. Subsequently the need to make the guideline of discourse acts an instrumental part of each ESL/EFL educational module.

2.6 Politeness Theory

Politeness was presented as a formal theoretical construct by Brown and Levinson. (1978; 1987), taking into account prior work on "face" by humanist Erving Goffman (1955). By (2002), it is a broad and complex hypothesis of the interpersonal underpinnings of language generation trying to answer why individuals don't generally talk in the clearest, most immediate, and most effective way that is available Cases of the craving to keep up negative face incorporate the wish to be allowed to sit unbothered, to act naturally coordinated and autonomous of others, and not to be confined or generally hindered upon.

Brown and Levinson (1987) maintain that individuals recognize that in order to maintain one's own positive and negative face, one must support the face needs of others. According to Lakoff (1973), Grice (1975), and Leech (1983), politeness can be considered as a communication strategy used to maintain good relationships between interlocutors. Lakoff proposed two rules to account for the pragmatic appropriateness of utterances: be clear and be polite. In a similar vein, Leech posits that the Politeness Principle is the necessary complement of Grice's Cooperative Principle and combines these principles in the concept of the Interpersonal Rhetoric, because the Cooperative Principle in itself cannot explain why people are often so indirect in expressing what they mean. In his opinion, the main function of politeness

is to maintain "social equilibrium and the friendly relations" which will eventually ensure the cooperation of our interlocutors (Leech, 1983: 82).

2.7 Cooperative Principle

Grice (1975) recommended that conversation is based on a shared principle of cooperation. He recommended that participants in a conversation obey a general cooperative principle (CP), which is expected to be in force whenever a conversation takes place. Grice defines CP as:

"Make your contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (1975, p. 45).

•**Quantity**: Make your commitment as useful as is required Do not make your commitment more useful than is required.

•**Quality**: Do not say what you accept to be false Do not say that for which you need satisfactory confirmation.

•**Relation:** Be significant.

•**Manner**: Avoid lack of clarity of expression; Avoid equivocalness; Be brief (stay away from pointless prolixity); Be efficient.

Grice (1975:45-46) As Grice proposes, there is an accepted way of speaking regarded as standard behavior by all of us. That is to say, when an utterance is produced or heard, it is assumed that it is generally true, has the right amount of information, is relevant, and is couched in understandable terms. If an utterance fails to conform to this model (See the example below), then we do not assume that the utterance is nonsense; rather, we assume that an appropriate meaning is there to be inferred. In Grice's terms, a maxim has been flouted, and an implicature generated.

Without such an assumption, it would not be worth investing the effort needed to interpret an indirect speech act.

A: Is there another pint of milk?

B: I'm going to the supermarket in five minutes.

2.8 Requests and Politeness as Speech Acts

Requests are the speech acts by which the speaker tries to get the hearer to do something. Searle (1979) categorizes requests as directive speech acts that have two realizations: direct and indirect requests. Direct requests occur when the illocutionary force (the speaker's real intention) of the request utterance conforms to its locutionary force (the literal meaning of the speaker's utterance). For instance, the utterance, „open the door", has the same intention as its literal meaning. Indirect requests, on the other hand, occur when the illocutionary force is different from the locutionary force of the request utterance. For instance, the requester can use the statement, „it is hot in here", to get the hearer to switch on a fan. The use of direct or indirect requests is constrained by social, situational and individual factors, such as social power, social distance, and degree of imposition, gender, age, occupation and educational background. According to these variables, the speaker may prefer a direct or indirect request in order to produce a tactful and polite request act.

Making requests is one of the most difficult and challenging speech acts for L2 learners as its proper execution involves "considerable cultural and linguistic expertise" that requires "a high level of appropriateness" (Blum-Kulka and Olshtain, 1984: 206). In performing requests, the speaker endeavors to minimize the imposition inherent in the act, a goal which is usually achieved by performing indirect strategies. In general, three levels of directness for request strategies are

distinguished in the Cross-cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989a, b). This model has become the most preferred model in later request studies (see Table 1).

Table 1: CCSARP Request Coding Scheme (Blum-Kulka et al. (1989a,b: 278–280)

MainStrategy	Sub-Strategy
1. Direct	(1) Mood derivable (imperative) (e.g., Leave me alone.)
	(2) Explicit performative (e.g., I'm asking you not to park the car here.)
	(3) Hedge performative (e.g., I must/have to ask you to clean the kitchen right now.)
	(4) Locution derivable (e.g., Madam, you'll have to/should/must/ought to/ move your car.)
	(5) Want statement (e.g., I wish you'd stop bothering me.)e.g (I would like to have aday off)
2.Conventional indirect	(6) Suggestory formula (e.g., Why don't you get lost?)
	(7) Query preparatory ability: (e.g., Can/Could I borrow your notes? Possibility :I was wondering if you would give me a lift.) willingness: would you be willing to lend me your dictionary?
3-Non-conventional Indirect	(8) Strong hint (Intention: getting a lift home: e.g., Will you be going home now?)
	(9) Mild hint (Intent: getting hearer to clean the kitchen: e.g., You've been busy here, haven't you?)

According to Brown and Levinson, when trying to produce a request, the speaker has two options: either to avoid producing the request since it is an FTA or to perform it in one of the following strategies:

1-*On record*, the speaker expresses his/her request baldly without any redress

2-*Positive politeness,* the speaker can save the hearer's positive face through preserving his /her desire to be approved.

3-*Negative politeness, the speaker can redress the imposition on the addressee's freedom*

4-*Off record, the speaker uses an ambiguous utterance (hint) and depends on the hearer's interpretation .*

2.9Interlanguage Studies

In interlanguage pragmatics, many studies have been conducted comparing the linguistic strategies of ESL/EFL learners to that of native speakers of English in terms of the use of request modifications. Among these studies is that by Faerch and Kasper (1989), who examined how Danish learners of English and German use internal and external modifiers; they also investigated the impact of situational and sociocultural factors on this use. Faerch and Kasper used a Written Completion Test (DCT) to collect the participants" responses in five situations. Despite the limitations of the DCT and the limited number of the modifiers within the classification used for coding their data, Faerch and Kasper arrived at interesting findings. With regard to internal modification, they found that the learners underused *downtoners* (e.g., perhaps, possibly, etc.), but overused the politeness marker, *please.* On the other hand, the *grounder* was the most frequent external modifier in both native speakers" and learners" requests. Faerch and Kasper concluded that Danish learners tend to employ "transparent, over-complex, explicit and longer procedures of request

modification" (p. 245). They attributed this phenomenon to the learners" low level of proficiency and lack of pragmatic competence. The pragmatic transfer from the learners" first language was also evident.

As a part of her contrastive study of request realization of Danish learners of English and British English native speakers, Trosborg (1995) investigated the use of internal and external modification devices. She used role-play interactions to collect her data, arguing that role-plays can help the researcher to gather authentic data because they allow the participants to say as much as they want in a natural way. The results of her study revealed that English native speakers used internal mitigating devices, especially the politeness marker, *please"*, *downtoner*, *past tense*, and *conditional clause* more often than Danish learners did, external modifications were also more frequent in the English native speakers" data than in the learners" data.

However, some external devices, especially the *supporting reasons,* were pervasive in the requests of both groups. Trosborg claimed that the divergence between English native speakers and Danish learners of English, in terms of the frequency of occurrence of request modifiers, results from the complex structure and use of some modifiers which make them more difficult for learners to master as well as the pragmatic transfer from the learners first language. Beal (1998) compared the request utterances produced by French non-native speakers of English with those produced by Australian English native speakers and French native speakers. She explored the speech act performance of L2 speakers in English, and the linguistic and cultural factors that may make this performance deviate from that of English native speakers. Beal used interview and observation techniques to collect the data in a workplace where French and Australian subjects were working.

26

The results of this study show that Australian subjects used request downgraders more than French non-native speakers of English (60% vs 40%). The results also indicate that request downgraders were less frequent in the requests of French native speakers. Beal attributes the deviant linguistic behavior of French non-native speakers of English to three factors: insufficient language proficiency, pragmalinguistic transfer from French, and the different cultural values and norms prevailing in French and Australian cultures. She concludes that linguistic and cultural variation between French and Australian cultures leads to a different realization of speech acts. Australians, unlike French, seem to be "unduly tentative, self-effacing and egalitarian" (p. 23) and, therefore, they use indirect requests with more downgraders.

According to Hassall (2001), which conducted a study to examine how Australian learners of Bahasa Indonesia use internal and external modifications in their requests. The modification devices found in the data obtained from 20 Australian learners of Bahasa were compared to those used by 18 native speakers of Bahasa Indonesia. Hassall used interactive oral role-play to collect request samples. The results of this study show that Australian learners used internal modifiers less frequently than Indonesian native speakers. However, Australian learners" use of external devices, especially *grounders,* was almost identical to that of the native speakers. Hassall argues that Australian learners may lack pragmatic knowledge in Indonesian and, therefore, underused the internal modifiers that require control over the pragma linguistic routines in the second language. He also argues that external modifiers do not usually require more complex pragma linguistic structure, and they explicitly perform the mitigating function; therefore, they are more pervasive in the learners" requests.

Woodfield and Economidou-Kogetsidis (2010), examined the internal and external request modifications employed by Greek, Japanese and German learners of English as compared to those used by British English native speakers. They used the DCTs to collect their data. The findings of this study reveal that ESL learners underused internal modifiers, especially the politeness marker please, consultative devices, cajoler and tense. They also show that the ESL learners employed external modifiers, especially preparator and groundermore often in their requests. The researchers attribute the underuse of internal modifiers to the lack of learners" proficiency in English and the lack of confidence in their linguistic abilities. The matter is different with external modifiers, especially grounders, which, according to Woodfield and Economidou-Kogetsidis, are active at an early stage of language acquisition.

2.10 Request of E-mail Cross-Cultural Studies

Through the e-mail is relatively anew channel of communication, which means that it would be a new challenge to its users,whether native or non-native speakers of the language medium to be used through this channel:e-mail is increasingly becoming an accepted means of communicationon the formal level, add let alone the informal level. As result the intention given to the use of pragmatics in written e-mail communocation is increasing much.Shea (1994) was the first who introduces 'netiquette'(ablend of network &Etiquette) principles in her article:Netiquette.In this article she aims at building rules and guidelines for behaving and interacting via written e-communication;these netiquette principles are then applied to wide range of communication, from formal for example bussiness e-mail, academic discussion boards,to informal for instance, personal e-mail, chat-room, fan clubs on the internet,etc.Netiquette   guidelins   nowadays   are   found   wherever   e-mail

communication takes place: they even found their way in to ESL textbooks(e.g,Ford& Kaspre, 2003;Halker, 2003;Swales&Feak,1994).

Many interesting studies which focused on the linguistic features of e-mail written messages e.g Baron(1994,2002 and 2003;Beebe&Herring 1996,1999, 2002; 2002, 2002, 2005,2006,2006 b Crystal 2001,etc).Most of these studies have found academic data contain an academic evidence of new written genres with unique textual features, most are notable apseudo-converstional form of communication conducted in extended time and with an absent interlocutors(Gains, 1999). This led to the possibilty of making pragmatic researches, as different pragmatic strategies are required to make, asuccessful e-mail communication for different purposes.

As e-mail communication was becoming global phenomenon, researchers motivated to examine cross-cultral differences found in written email communicaion, especially those found in formal environment. These studies were mainly interested in investigating cross-cultral miscommunication that arises because of culturally different perceptions of appropriatenss in e-mail communication and internetusage. Inglis (1984), for example, suggests that companies should make email communication and computer use rules explicit to employees and that they also should attempt to understand different cultural expactations that some employes may have about e-communication and computer usage.

Furthermore,one may find that the academic area, studies like Chen (2001),for instance, analyses and compares e-mail requests sent by Taiwanese and US graduate-students to their professors, in which she comes up with the conclusion that

Taiwanese use different request strategies than that used by US students due to cultrally different perception of power relations, familiies and impostion(Chen,2001).Rinehart wrote adessertation in which he focused on the reason that stipulates why ESL graduate students use e-mail too communicate with their instructors. The study finds out that the main subjects in those e-mails are mainly phatic conversations with their instructors and asking instructional help(2001. Cited in Ford &Kasper, 2003)Biesnbach-Lucas(2005) also makes acomparison between American strategies of communication used in written e-mail and those of instructional students to conclude that NSs of English demonstrate greater resources in creating E-polite messages to their professors than NNSs.

What is more relevant to this study are those studies that deal with the pragmatics of email requests in ESL and EFL.One of those studies is of Haford and Bardovi-Harling(1996).This study deals with e-mails sent by NSs and NNSs graduate students to their professors so as to analysis for perlocutionary affect of e-mail requests. In their study come out with the conclusion that NNSse-mail do not adress imposions adequetly, which negatetively affect perlocution force, and that NNSs messages,in general, contain fewer, down graders and other supportive moves like grounders and apologies which give anegative impact of the request.Another example is the study of kankaanatanta(2005), cited in Ford &Kasper, (2003) whichreports that Finish and Swedish collegues of one European company, show signinficant differnces across L1 groups in their use of politeness strategies in English Email messages.

Blum-kulka et al. (1989) stress the importance of increase in familirity, which fosters more directness, 'as well as with the transition from the public to the private domin' (p.4).On the other hand, when formality increases,the need to use more indirect forms is ecpected to be seen,and Economidou-Kogetsidis(2011) puts it in e-mailing language as follows: '' email messages addressed upwards are expected to be characterized by greater formality,less directness and agreater degree of external and/or internal mitigation'' (p.3195). Even children develop the sense of directness and indirectness at early stages. Blum-Kulka et al. (1985) found that children and adults use less direct requests to hearers in adominent position, which shows that they adapt the directness of their requests in accordance with the relative pwer of the adress.In another study with children, Ervin-Tripp (1982) found that young (American) children use more imperative when they communicate with their mither than with the fathers,and use orders while talking to sibling and come up with polite requests with strangers.

Bloch(2002) conducted another study to see how L2 learners use when they need to communicate with their instructors. The results showed that the partcipants made use of differnt strategies in e-mailing; however, some of these strategies were not quite appropriate, as the learners did not seeem to be aware of the fact that the e-mails were to be read by somebody who was superior to them in terms of power. He came to the conclusion that writing e-mail is more than knowing the language; it also about using the appropriate forms at appropriate instances. Biesenbach-Lucass(2005) focused on email conversation between the faculty and the students; this study further supported the idea that L2 learners were less succeful in e-mil interactions in topics such as requesting aresponse from their professor and offerring some response

to them. Danielewicz-Betz(2013) focused ont the student –faculty communication by e-mail from German, Saudi and Japanese studens who were communicating with their professors in English.The research revealed that the impolite acts make up the majoirty of the acts in their data and students are not quite successful in employing appropriate e-mailing styles and elements in their e-mails to faculty. The researcher also drew several implications for language teaching.

Furthermore, she finds that her subjects of study prefer imperative and interogative request forms, which can be negatively affect politeness and increase the threat of hear's face.Similarly, Al-Ammar (2000), cited in Umar (2004), has studied the linguistic strategies and realizationsof request behavior in spoken English and Arabic. The subjects used in this study areforty-five Saudi female students enrolled in the English department at university level. The instrumentused for data collection is the "Discourse-Completion-Test". The result reveals thatthe subjects vary their requestive behavior according to the social situations. Directness increaseswith decreases in social distance and power. Moreover Umar (2004) conducted a sociolinguistic investigation into the request strategies used by advancedArab learners of English as compared to those strategies used by native speakers ofEnglish. The sample involves 20 Arab students enrolled in graduate English courses in fourArabic universities and 20 British students perusing graduate programs in three British universities.A Discourse-Completion-Test is used to generate data related to the request strategiesused by each group. Results indicated that the two groups adopt similar strategies when addressingtheir request to equals or people in higher positions.

In such cases, the subjects relyheavily on conventionally indirect strategies. When requests are addressed to people in lowerpositions the Arabic sample shows a marked tendency towards using more direct requeststrategies in performing their request than the British sample. A further test of the data revealssome significant differences between the two groups in the way they modify their requeststrategies. It is found that the native speakers of English use more semantic and syntacticmodifiers than their Arabic counterparts due to the linguistic superiority of the nativespeakers group. Moreover, the study demonstrated that Arab students of English, even at advancedlevels, may fall back on their cultural background when formulating their requestsstrategies.

On the pedagogical level, Arab learners of English should always be made awareof the pragmatic differences between Arabic and English and that an appropriate Arabic requestscheme in a given situation might not be appropriate in English in the same situation.Finally Biesenbach-Lucas (2006) asserts that the e-mail medium affects the language used by NSs and NNSs, and especially how that conveys the sense of e-politeness in spite of varying levels of imposion.

2.11 Summary

This chapter has outlined the scenario on the literaturebody involving the most influential theoretical underpinnings that underlie pragmatics and the use of speech acts to communicate one of the most predominating functions like requests. It has also given reference to the contextual de facto of the teaching and learning of pragmatics in the Arab world in general, and in Iraq, in particular, in a way that helps report difficulties encountered and investigate these difficulties for the purpose of

improving Iraqi learners' pragmatic competence and raise their awareness of the importance of speech acts in purposefull communication.

Reviewing the body of literature on the above-mentioned issues has been fruitful for conducting the current study. For example, with its direct and interconnected relationship with the statement of the problem, the chapter sought to build up a knowledge-based informational profile that helps develop the study's procedural pattern. In other words, it helps to pave the way towards how the research questions can be answered and governs the appropriate methods to be applied to collect data and find the study's suggested results. Also, the intervention of both theory and practice, which has been accomplished through presenting theories like Speech Act theory, Cooperative Principle, and TheCross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP) (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989) beside the contextual global and local studies on speech acts, more specifically requests, has all contributed to have a solid literature background that helps the researcher to intervene in a local EFL context like Iraq and investigate the request speech act handling and modification as used by Iraqi target language learners.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides an overview of the research methodology used in the present study, which involves the research design,the participants of the study who formulated the English emails requests to their professors from different universities located in Turkish Northern Cyprus,the context of the study. Nevertheless, it presents an instrument for collection data, the procedures for data collection Finally it provided data Analysis Procedures.

3.1 Research Design

The present study aims to identify the request strategies preferred by Iraqi postgraduate students and to find out whether pragmatic transfer exists in their request performances. In order to fulfil the aims mentioned above, the present study has adopted the descriptive statictics for interlanguage study, which includes collection and analysis of comparable sets of interlanguage study, first language and the target language. Furthermore, this study has been analysis into two methods such as qualitative and quantitative analysis of the data collected. In qualitative analysis, classify the collected data (the head acts) of the email requests in terms of the level of directness. Moreover, the sub-strategies were classified. The quantitative analysis was led with SPSS 15.0. It included. The directness level of request strategy (direct, conventional indirect and non- conventional indirect) from 'Imperatives' (1) to 'Strong hint' (9). For example, the highest point 7 indicates the highest indirectness and politeness. Moreover, the criteria of analysis that are merely pragmatic variations

result from different formal linguistic features, which may realize the pragmatic transfer from L1 to L2. It may have positive or negative outcome it depends on the level of directness which is different from one culture to another according to L1 sociocultural norms, beliefs, and customs to the target language, which does, or not share the same norms as their L2. Consequentlythe process of coding distribute the frequency and percentage of request formulations of each participant through their preferences and see the highest and lowest rate for IL group by comparing with other baseline data groups.

3.2 Participants

The Participants of the study was divided into one IL group (IPGSs) and other two baseline groups. The IL group contains 100 Iraqi Arab postgraduate students (IPGS henceforth) (20 females and 80 males). All the participants who were asked to formulate English E-mails to their own professors were postgraduate students at different universities in North Cyprus. They were enrolled in the postgraduate program. Their ages ranged from 23 to 45. The students as participants were majoring in different scientific academic fields. The participants were supposed to be an advanced level of language proficiency, as all of them had completed their undergraduate studies in EFL context and they had studied English for at least two years in B.A just scientific fields.

 As a requirement for entering their M.A and Ph.D programs, they should pass an examination for language proficiency in order tobe accepted in high studies as postgraduate students. The total number of students from the Eastern Mediterranean University was 37 comprising 6 Ph.D and 31 M.A students. The students from Near East University were 30 in numbers, and they were 4 Ph.D and 23 Master students'.

The students of Cyprus International University were only 6 Master's, whereas Girne American University's total number of students was 27 comprsing 8 Ph.D and19 MA students.

The second baseline group of participants was consisted of 10 British English native speakers (BENSs) (8 males and 2 females), who were randomly selected for the purpose of the study. All of them are living in Manchester city, the UK, and their ages were between 28 and 35. Six of them are currently studying in Newcastle University, whereasthe other four have finished their study.

All of them were British native speakers, and they don't speak Arabic; they speak other languages instead such as French, Spanish, and Italian.The third baseline group of the participants consisted of 10 Iraqi Arab native speakers (IANSs) (8 males and 2 females), and they finished B.A in different universities in Iraq. They are living in different cities in Iraq, and they don't know English well. They seemed to have a low language proficieny, which is limited to knowledge of the basic rules they studied at high school.

Table 2: The Ages of the Participants

Age	Frequency
23-30	9
31-35	19
36-40	57
41-45	15
Total	100

3.3 Context

The present study concerns itself with researching request patterns made by Iraqi postgraduate students who were enrolled as Master and Ph.D candidtates in different study disciplines at at four Universities in North Cyprus. These universieties were Eastern Mediterranean University, Near East University, Cyprus International University and Girne American University.

These universities were the leading universities in the country and most postgraduate studies were handled in English as a medium of instruction. Such a thing was a motivation for the Iraqi students to pursue their postgraduate studies there. As the Iraqi postgraduate students in North Cyprus are now a big number, and they were all handling their studies in English, this study sought to address the way how these students communicate with others, more specifically, how they make requests as part of their communication with their professors at academic setting.

Table 2 shows these universities with numbers and percentages of Iraqi participants taken from each. As the study is based on random selection of its participants,

samples from the Iraqi postgraduate students studying at the above-mentioned universities were taken to conduct this study with its academic purpose. Table 2 gives reference to the study participants randomly selected from each university context.

Table 3: The Universties of North Cyprus

University	Frequency	Percentage
EMU	37	37%
NEU	30	30%
CIU	6	6%
GAU	27	27%
Total	100	100%

3.4 Data Collection Instruments

In this study, data collection instrument employed in the present study was the dicourse completion tests (DCTs).DCTs were adapted to collect the data and gathered information to achieve this purpose. The DCTs consist of two parts (see appendix A). The first part of DCT has been devoted for collecting the data about the particpants' background information such as nationality, gender, what language do they speak with their parents and what is their level in English as aforeign language. The second part (see appendix B) of the discourse completion tests were related to email request strategies.

There are two versions of DCTs discourse completion tests were employed, the first version consists five different academic situations; the second version of DCTs were

39

translated into Arabic native language for Arabic baseline data group according to Wouk (2006), a large number of the studies (Beebe and Cummings, 1995; kasper and Dahl, 1991; sasaki, 1998) support the utilization of this instrument for the investigation of discourse acts, which is likewise the motivation behind this study. In the current study, the data elicitation method was developed by Blum-Kulka (1982, followingLevenston, 1975) to collect speech acts samples performed by native and non-native speakers. The DCTs consist of five situations representing different request situations.

The DCTs used included a brief description of the situations that has practical methodological and theoretical advantages over the field study.The classification was following Hartford and Bordovi-Harlig's study (1996) in British academic surroundings. In order to address the ethical issues in relation to such a study, the IL group of E-mail Requests in English, Participants were informed that their e-mails would be kept confidential and no personal information would be revealed.

The study assumed that there is a lack of pragmatic competency in terms of request strategies between British English Native English speakers and Non native English speakers. Such asumpation arise the question like whether the mother tongue languge impacts the perfomace in target languge and whether the profeciency level has arole in the production of request strategies even if the participants have advance level. To answer these questions, discourse completion tests were adapted to collect the data and gathered information to achieve this purpose.

3.5 Data Collection Procedures

The emails were collected as a part of the online survey mentioned in such section.The procees of collecting data was divided into three stages. The first stage is obtaining the data fromthe IL group (IPGSs). The DCT English version was sent to the participants through email with the consent form. They were asked to respond the given situations provided in the DCT as naturally as possible and returned them back to the researcher's email. The DCTs included five situations in which the participants should compose hypothetical emails requesting their professors as each situation required. The emails sentwere then collected, and the total number was 100 emails including five hundred request situations. The emails were formuated where the Iraqi postgraduate students directly addressed their professors at the four above-mentioned universities in North Cyprus. In the second stage of obtaining the data of email communications, a friend of the researcher, who is currently studying inthe UK, was asked to help in administering and distributing the DCTs among his British native-speaker classmates. They were provided with the English version of the DCTs, and they participated in responding to them and making their request emails according to the situations given.

In thethird stage, the Iraqi Arab native speakers (IANSs) living in Iraq were asked to make the same request emails but in Arabic as the Arabic version was sent to them through email. 10 emails were sent back to the researcher through email, and they included their responses to the five DCT situations (N= 50 situations). These situations mainly focused on the request strategies they used in their request-based emails; athing which helped in the analyzing the resultant data.

3.6 Data Analysis Procedures

The coding process of the e-mail messages generally followed the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) coding manual (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989). According to the CCSARP coding scheme, the essential unit analyses in this study is the request expressions (head acts), that were formulated by each participant in every situation, introduced in the email communication. The analysis was adopted in this study almost followed the CCSARP, which was discussed in the previous chapter, and it was considered the most extensive empirical investigation of cross-cultural pragmatics.

In CCSARP Blum-Kulka et.al. (1989), the study was limited to identify the exact message that contains the head act of request form. The head act of the request form applied internally (i.e.the request utterance proper). Consequently the email request utterances were analyzed under three dimensions: request strategies (i.e., direct, conventional indirect and non-conventional indirect) Request strategies refer to the linguistic elements used to convey the head act of the request strategy which analyses according to four steps. The first step of request e-mail message was analysed into two parts: The first part the request head act, which can be applied to the directness level, which may occur within the head act in the request sequence. The second part can be adapted internally which divided into some other sub-categories, to come out with the head acts so the result is the following coding categories, which represented with examples from the data under investigation. The second step of data analysis involved the identifying and categorizing the head act of request strategies according to the classification explained in literature review chapter two. These strategies were classified according to linguistic structure and pragmatic value.

The third stage was to identify the frequency and percentage of all request strategies formulations by using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) in order to accumulate the overall use of head act in each group's data, in the last stage revealed the IL (IPGSs) preferences with other baseline groups (BENS, IANS) in terms of choose the request strategies. These categories of directness level correspond to the degree of pragmatic clarity of request, from the direct to the non-conventional indirect. Each category is included into some other sub-categories, Each main category is divided into other sub-categories of request head act which might be Mood derivable, Explicit performative, Hedge performative, Locution derivable, want statement, suggestory formula, Query preparatory, Strong hint and Mild hint to come out with the head acts so the result is the following coding categories, which represented examples from the data under examination.

3.7 Limitation and Delimitations of the Study

This study possesses certain limitations, which have been delimited by taking specific steps. First of all, gender differences have not been considered due to the fact that the number of male graduate students from Iraq is immeasurably exceeds that of female students. Therefore, it did not seem quite reasonable to focus on gender as one of the variables. However, it could also be assumed that culture wise there cannot be significant differences between them in terms of their behavior concerning supervisor-supervisee relationship. Second of all, the study may seem to be limited in terms of the number of participants, Arab graduate students.

It should be noted, however, our focus was on Arab students from one specific group, Iraqi graduate students. Moreover, the study involved students not only from one university, Eastern Mediterranean University, but also those who pursue their

further education in all universities of North Cyprus. This is, in fact, may serve as delimitations. Finally, this study focused on an investigating the core aspect of request strategies (i.e. DS, CIS, NIS) without going deep into detailed description categories, sub-categories and pragmatic process involved in performing request as speech act. It would also be interesting to focus on other constructs as well. But, focusing on other aspects as well might have negative impact on the depth of analysis.

3.8 Summary

This chapter was presented the methodology adopted to collect and analysis the data.The overall research design, Participants and instruments used in collecting the data and explained how collecting the discourse completion tests data as well as explain an instrument (DCTs) that is used. It has also presented the data analysis procedures of gathering the information; data collection, data processing.

Chapter 4

DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Data Analysis

In this chapter, the results of the coding process are presented. More specifically, based on the frequency of all the semantic formulas used by IL group and baseline groups. In section 4.2 below, identify the Iraqi postgraduate students' preferences of requeststrategies and sub-strategies. The rest of the section and sub-sections (4.3,4.3.1,4.3.2,4.3.3,4.3.4,4.3.5) focused on the frequency of each individual frequency of request directness level in each situation. First the analysis of direct request strategy, followed by conventional indirect request strategy and finally Non-convectional Indirect request strategy.

4.2 Analysis of Main Requesting Strategies and Sub-strategiesby Situation

This section identified the coding process of the three hypotheses' responses, which deal with head acts of request strategies and sub-strategies preferences. The analyses in this section firstly identify the IPGS groups' choice of request category and sub-strategies preferences (see Table 3). Secondly, it also identified the BENS and IANS groups' choice of request directness level. First comes the analysis of direct request strategy, followed by conventional indirect request strategy and finally Non-convectional Indirect request strategy that analyzes according to five different academic situations.

Furthermore, it summarizes the three levels of responses, which deal with the head act of request strategies and sub-strategies according to the level of directness types across all five different academic situations. (See tables 4,5,6,7,8,9).

4.2.1Iraqi Postgraduate Students' Prefernces of Request Strategies (sub-Strategies)

The analyses of Iraqi postgraduate students' (IPGS henceforth) request preferences are presented in Table 3 with reference to numbers, frequency and percentages of each request main strategy and its related sub-strategies.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics of Sub-Request Strategies

Strategies	Sub-Strategies	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5
DS	1-Moodderivable	(0%)	(0%)	(0%)	(2 %)	(0%)
	2-Explicit performative	(10%)	(7%)	(0%)	(8%)	(6%)
	3-Hedge performative	(0%)	(10%)	(0 %)	(2%)	(14%)
	4-Locution derivable	(0%)	(0%)	(0%)	(2%)	(0%)
	5-Want statement	(51%)	(10%)	(10%)	(60%)	(8%)
Total		(61%)	(27%)	(10%)	(74%)	(28%)
CIS	6-Suggestory formula	(1%)	(2%)	(3%)	(0 %)	(10%)
	7-Query preparatory	(36%)	(73%)	(87%)	(22%)	(64%)
Total		(37%)	(75%)	(90%)	(22%)	(74%)
NIS	8-Strong hint	(2%)	(0 %)	(0%)	(14%)	(0%)
	9-Mild hint	(0%)	(0%)	(0%)	(0%)	(0%)
Total		(2%)	(0%)	(0%)	(14%)	(0%)

As can be seen from Table 3 the Iraqi postgraduate students (IPGSs) preferred to use direct strategy to request, especially in the first and third situations with percentages of 61% and 74%, respectively. Within Situation1, Want statement took the highest percentage (51%) as the most preferred sub-category of the request direct strategy. The same thing goes in Situation 3 as want statement scored 60% of the Iraqi postgraduate students' preferences.

In contrary, conventionally indirect strategies were mostly preferred in Situation 2, 3, and 5, with percentages of 90%, 87% and 74% given to each situation, respectively. The Query Preparatory was the most preferred sub-category indicated by their percentages. As regards non-conventionally indirect strategies, the results revealed the students were not in favour to use this request category, as the highest usage percentage scored is 14% across all situations. 4.3 Level of Directness acorss DCT Situations and Groups. This section presents the findings related to the participating groups' use of request main strategies across the five DCT situations.

4.3.1Analysis of Appointment Situation

Direct request strategies were highly used by the two Iraqi groups; namely, IPGSs and IANSs, as indicated by their percentages 61% and 90%. However, half of the BENS (50%) used this strategy to request making an appointment. Table 4 gives reference to the analyses of other categories and groups' uses.

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics of Main Request Strategy: Appointment Situation

	Main Requesting Strategies			
Situation	Groups	DS (%)	CIS (%)	NIS (%)
Appointment	IPGS	61(61%)	37 (37%)	2 (2%)
	BENS	5 (50 %)	5 (50 %)	0 (0%)
	IANS	9 (90 %)	1 (10 %)	0 (0%)

The table shows that the IPGS group also had a relative preference to use the CISs while requesting to make an appointment with a percentage of 37% as compared to their preferences to use NIS strategies (2%). Moreover, as half of the BENS group preferred to use CIS, nobody used the NIS in this situation. In contrary, the IANS group didn't use the NIS at all, and only 1 used the CIS (1%).

 As shown in the following examples from the appointment situation:

a) Please, *I would like to meet and discuss with you about my project if possible during the course of the week*? (Data from IPGS group)

b) *I would be very grateful for your input. I was hoping that we could arrange an appointment. Please, could you advise me on a convenient day and time to meet?* (Data from BENS group)

c) *Austath, mumkin taateni min waktik Aluom akablik?* (Data from IANS group)

4.3.2 Analysis of Committe Situation

Conventionally indirect strategies were highly used by the one group; namely, IPGSs, as indicated by their percentages 73%. However, half of the BENS (50%) used this strategy to request making a committee. Table 4 gives reference to the analyses of other categories and groups' uses.

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics of Main Request Strategy: Committee Situation

Situation	Groups	DS (%)	CIS (%)	NIS (%)
			Main Requesting Strategies	
Committee	IPGS	27 (27%)	73 (73%)	0 (0.0%)
	BENS	5 (50%)	5 (50 %)	0 (0%)
	IANS	7 (70 %)	3 (30 %)	0 (0%)

The table shows that the IPGS group also had a relative preference to use the direct strategy while requesting to make acommitteewith a percentage of 27% as compared to their preferences to use NIS strategies (0%). Moreover, as half of the BENS group preferred to use conventionally indirect strategies, nobody used the non-conventionally indirect strategies in this situation. In contrary, the IANS group didn't use the NIS at all, and only 70 highlyused the direct strategy (70 %), and 30 low used theConventionally indirect strategy (30).

As shown in the following examples from the committee situation:

a) *I am honored to invite you to be a part of the jury members committee during my defense day. I hope that you accept my invitation.(Data from IPGS group)*

b) *I would like to invite you sir to be my committee member. Looking forward to hearing*

from you. (Data from BENS group)

c)*byed athenk ataath aheb takoun atho belejent alamanagasha? (Data from IANS group)*

4.3.3 Analysis of Registeration Situation

Conventionally indirect strategies were highly used by the one group; namely, IPGSs, as indicated by their percentages 90%. However, the BENS (30%) used this strategy to request making Registration. Table 4 gives reference to the analyses of other categories and groups' uses.

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics of Main Request Strategy: Registration Situation

	Main Requesting Strategies			
Situation	Groups	DS (%)	CIS (%)	NIS (%)
Registeration	IPGS	10 (10.0%)	90 (90%)	0 (0%)
	BENS	3 (30 %)	3 (30%)	4 (40%)
	IANS	7 (70 %)	3 (30 %)	0 (0%)

The table shows that the IPGS groups' had a low preference to use the direct strategy while requesting to make registration with a percentage of 10% as compared to their preferences to use non-conventional indirect strategies (0%). Moreover, the BENS groups' preferred to use the direct strategy and conventionally indirect strategies, 30 %, nobody used the non-conventionally indirect strategies except BENS groups' 40% in this situation. In contrary, the IANS group didn't use the non-conventional indirect strategies at all, and only 70 highly used the direct strategy (70 %), and 30 low used the Conventionally indirect strategy (30%).

As shown in the following examples from the registeration situation:

a)I couldn't register to my courses for next semester _can you help me please?_

(Data from IPGS group).

b) I am interested in EMU course but there is vacant spot. <u>Can you help me to book</u>

a spot, an extra one please?(Data from BENS group).

c) Rajaan austath, etha tegdar tesejle belcourse eli endak maakder asjel. (Data from IANS

group)

4.2.4 Analysis of Asignature Situation

Direct request strategies were highly used by the two Iraqi groups; namely, IPGSs and IANSs, as indicated by their percentages 64% and 70%. However, the BENS groups' (10%) used this strategy to request making a signature. Table 4 gives reference to the analyses of other categories and groups' uses.

Table 8:Descriptive Statistics of Main Request Strategy: Asignature Situation

	Main Requesting Strategies		
Situation	Groups	DS (%)	CIS (%)	NIS (%)
Asignature	IPGS	64 (64 %)	22 (22%)	14 (14 %)
	BENS	1 (10 %)	6 (60 %)	3 (30%)
	IANS	7 (70 %)	3 (30 %)	0 (0%)

The table shows that the IPGS groups' also had a relative preference to use the conventionally indirect strategies while requesting to make a signature with a percentage of 22 % as compared to their preferences to use the non-conventionally indirect strategies (14%). On the other hand, as the BENS groups' preferred to use the conventionally indirect strategies, (60%) and used the non-conventionally indirect strategies (30%) in this situation. In contrary, the IANS group didn't use the non-conventionally indirect strategies at all, but they used conventionally indirect strategies (30%).

As shown in the following examples from a signature   situation:

a) I really need your signature for my degree plan.<u>can you help me sir</u> (Data from

IPGS group)

b) <u>I need to get my degree plan </u>signed by a member of the teaching faculty <u>and I was</u>

<u>hoping you could help</u>. (Data from BENS group)

c) Rajaan austath,min fathelik ireed twaglee alla the kada akoon mamnoon. (Data from

IANS group)

4.2.5 Analysis of Update Situation

Conventionally indirect strategies were highly used by the three groups; namely,

IPGSs, BENSs and IANSs as indicated by their percentages 72%. However, the

BENS (60%) and IANSs (70%) used this strategy to request making Registeration.

Table 4 gives reference to the analyses of other categories and groups' uses.

Table 9: Descriptive Statistics of Main Request Strategy: Update Situation

Situation	Main Requesting Strategies			
	Groups	DS (%)	CIS (%)	NIS (%)
Update	IPGSs	28 (28 %)	72 (72 %)	0 (0%)
	BENS	3 (30 %)	6 (60 %)	1 (10%)
	IANS	3 (30 %)	7 (70 %)	0 (0%)

The table shows that the IPGS groups' also had a relative preference to use the direct

strategy while requesting to make an update with a percentage of 28 % as compared

to their preferences to use non-conventional strategies (0%). Moreover, the BENS

groups' preferred to use direct strategies, nobody used the non-conventional

strategies except BENS groups' 10 % in this situation. In contrary, the IANS groups'

didn't use the non-conventional strategies at all, and they used the direct strategies (30%).

As shown in the following examples from anupdate situation:

a) *Sir you didn't update the course, so can you please do it?* (Data from IPGS group)

b) *Please could you advise me where to find them? If the files have not been updated yet, please could you confirm when they will be available?*

(Data from BENS group)

c) Mumkinyaany *astath tehadeth almalafat? Allah yekhlich.* (Data from IANS group*)*

4.8 Summary

This section summarize the three levels of responses, which deal with the head act of request strategies and sub-catogeriesaccording to the level of directness types across all five different academic situations. The analysis in this section proceeds as follows. First comes the analysis of direct strategies, followed by conventional indirect request strategy and finally non-convectional indirect request strategy.

Table 10: Descriptive Statistics of Main Request Strategy Types

Main Request Strategies	IPGS (%)	BENS F (%)	IANS (%)
Direct	190 (38%)	17 (34%)	33 (66%)
Convetionally Indirect	294 (58%)	25 (50%)	17 (34%)
Non-Conventional indirect	16 (3.20 %)	8 (16%)	0 (0 %)

4.8.1 Direct Strategy

In order to address the three levels of responses for request strategies, the main strategies were coded in accordance with the CCSARP manual. Table 10 showed the

descriptive statistics of the direct request strategy for combined situations with reference to the total frequency and percentage of data, we should first note that the most preferred, particularly in the IANS group's. Indeed by looking at Table 10, we can see that the frequency of 33 individual responses out of 50, which accounted for (66%) occurrences concentrated on the direct strategy. But, the least IPGS group's preferences showed that the frequency of 190 out of 500 individual responses, which accounted for (38%) occurrences concentrated on the direct strategy. Nevertheless, the IPGSs data in Table 4 showed that the IPGS group's use of direct strategy is mainly limited to the first two sub-categories, namely, ` Want statement ' which accounts for 27.8% of the IPGS group's use of the direct strategy sub-categories `Explicit performative' which accounts for 6.2% and Explicit performative which accounts for 4.8%. The last two categories only account in total for 2% of the entire data.

In contrary, the BENS group's showed that the direct strategy has low frequency. Indeed by looking Table 10, we can see that the frequency of 17 occurrences of direct strategy in the entire BENS group's data, out of 50, which accounted for (34%) occurrences concentrated on the direct strategy. The entire BENS group's data are low to show any particular trends except that they were non-preferred. Like the IPGSs' data, whereas the IANS group's frequency showed that the direct strategy has highly preferred.

Indeed, as the total situations show, the IANS group's had the highest frequency in the use of direct strategy. But unlike the other two groups whose use of direct strategy concentrated on a particular type. Despite the greater spread of the strategies, which are very low frequencies and the data did not show any clear

patterns. For the distribution of the direct strategy sub-strategies for the IPGS group's by a situation, the reader is referred to Table 4. As to the request strategies sub-categories, through the data frequency distribution showed considerable data inter-group variations, particularly within the IPGS group's across five situations at Table 4 shows a small number of occurrences of direct strategy sub-types Hence, because of low frequencies.

4.8.2 Conventionally Indirect Strategy

As shown in Table 4 conventionally indirect requesting strategies and subcategories made up the majority of the responses made by the IPGS group's. Furthermore, Table 10 provided clear evidence that their preferences of conventionally indirect strategies were generally used across five different academic situations. In other words, the group largely used one particular directness level to formulate their requests and it is explained from one particular level. Table 10 showed the descriptive statistics of the conventionally indirect strategies for combined situations with referenced to total frequency and percentage of data, firstly we note that the highest frequency, particularly in the IPGSs' data.

Indeed by looking at the frequency of 294 individual responses out of 500, which accounts for (58%) occurrences concentrated on the conventionally indirect strategies. Nevertheless, the IPGS group's showed that the conventionally indirect strategy sub-categories were mainly limited to the only two sub-categories, namely, ` Query preparatory ' which accounts for 56.48% of the IPGS group's use of the Conventionally Indirect strategy sub-type` Suggestory formula ' which accounts for 3.8% of the entire data.

On the other hand the BENS group's choice of conventionally indirect strategy for combined situations with referenced to the total frequency and percentage of data, we should first note that the highest frequency, particularly in the BENS group's data. Indeed by looking at Table 6, we noticed that the frequency of 25 individual responses out of 50 that accounts for (50%) occurrences concentrated on the conventionally indirect strategy. The BENS group's preferences for conventionally indirect strategy in the appointment and committee situations showed considerable resemblance, which accounts (50%).

In other both signature and update situations, the conventionally indirect strategy account for (60%) most responses. In contrary, the IANS group's showed that the conventionally indirect strategy has low frequency. Indeed, as the total entire data showed there are only 17 occurrences of direct strategy in the entire IANSs' data, out of 50, which accounts for (34%) occurrences concentrated on the conventionally indirect strategy. The entire IANS groups' data are low to show any particular trends except that they were not preferred.

4.8.3 Non-conventionally Indirect Strategy

The analysis of the data showed that there were quite a few occurrences of non-conventionally indirect strategies for all three groups across all five different academic situations. Table 10 showed the descriptive statistics of the non-conventionally indirect strategies for combined situations with referenced to total frequency and percentage of data, firstly we noted that the very low frequency, particularly in the IPGS group's data.

Indeed by looking at the IPGS group's preferences showed that the frequency of 17 individual responses out of 500 patterns which accounted for (3.2%) occurrences

concentrated on the non-conventionally indirect strategies, As showed in Table 4, a small number of occurrences of non-conventionally indirect strategies sub-categories are mainly limited to the only two sub-categories, namely, ` strong hints' which accounted for 3.2% of the IPGS group's use of the non-conventionally indirect strategies sub-categories `Mild hints ' which accounted for 0.0% . However, the total data for BENS group's there were only 8 individual responses out of 50 patterns, which accounted for (16%) occurrences concentrated on the non-conventionally indirect strategies. In contrary, the IANS group's didn't prefer to use the non-conventional indirectness across five situations.

Chapter 5

THE FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, following a brief summary of the findings of this study, I will proceed toevaluate the present work on the basis of its overall features, as well as conclue the discussion of findings, consider itspedogiogical implications, and raise issues for further studies.

5.2 Discussion of the Findings

Based on the research questions, in this section to review the answers provided by the produced data. To begin with, I asked what are the requests strategies preferred by Iraqi Arab post-graduate students while performing the speech act of request email.Further,what is the role of learners native language transfer in performing the speech act of request email?The analyses of the dataincluded requesting strategies. In answering the questions, I came to the following findings and conclusions.

5.2.1 Research Question

1-What are the request strategies preferred by Iraqi Arab post-graduate students while performing the speech act of request email?

The coding process of request strategies revealed that the Iraqi postgraduate students (henceforth IPGSs) preferred to use direct strategy to request, especially in the appointment and registeration situations with percentages of 61% and 74%, respectively. Within an appointment situation, direct request strategy is mainly

58

limited to the two sub-catogeries, namely, `Want statement' took the highest percentage (51%) as the most preferred sub-category of the direct request strategy, 'Explicit performative' took the lowest percentage (10%) as the less preferred sub-category of the direct request strategy.

The same thing goes in registeration situationas ' Want statement ' took the highest percentage (60%) as the most preferred sub-category of the direct request strategy, 'Explicit performative' took the lowest percentage (8%) as the less preferred sub-category of the direct request strategy as well as mood derivable which took (2%) and Hedge performative which atook (2%)the entire data. In contrary, conventionally indirect strategies were mostly preferred in committee, registeration, and update situations, with percentages of 90%, 87% and 74% given to each situation, respectively. The 'Query Preparatory' was the most preferred sub-categoty indiacted by their percentages. As regards non-conventionally indirect strategies, the results revealed the students were not in favour to use this request category, as the highest usage percentage scored is 14% across all situations.

Generally the overall result findings of request strategies revealed that the IL group (IPGSs) and other research groups (BENSs and IANSs) as shown, the overall frequency and percentage of conventionally indirect request are prominently preferred by post-graduate students (IPGSs) which are similar to English baseline group in term of level of directnessthat are more common in the IL group emails. In contrary the Arabic baseline group (IANSs) utilized different level of directness.
On the other hand, there is distinction between the two groups IPGS and BENSin terms of the selection of the situations in which they preferred to employ request

strategy.However, there is possibly a slight rise in the use of direct strategies especially, in the appointment situations and the asignature situation, on the other hand, the frequency distribution of the non- conventionally indirect strategies are too low frequency.

To summarise the finding discussion, I have suggested that BENS group's use of requesting strategies is not routinized, but highly responsive to situational constraints.Furthermore, the contextual constraints that seemed to have been most influential inthe formulation of requests were discussed largely as a function of the distancedimension, and only secondarily in terms of status. As to the dimension ofimposition, which was not systematically varied across the situations.

The findings of the study are resembled such previous studies Al-Ammar (2000), cited Umar (2004), who has studied the linguistic strategies and realizationsof request behavior in spoken English and Arabic.The result revealed thatthe subjects varied their requestive behavior according to the social situations. Directness increaseswith decreases in social distance and power. Moreover Umar (2004),conducted a sociolinguistic investigation into the request strategies used by advancedArab learners of English as compared to those strategies used by native speakers ofEnglish.In such cases, the subjects relyheavily on conventionally indirect strategies. When requests are addressed to people in lowerpositions the Arabic sample showed a marked tendency towards using more direct requeststrategies in performing their request than the British sample.

On the other hand by looking at the frequences of the direct and indirect utterances, it can be asserted that the indirect utterances exceed direct utterances Blum-kulka et al.

(1989) has pointed out that familiarity increases the notion of directness. The students probably preferred more direct uses since they know their teacher well. Howeverthe findings are different from what Economidou-kogetsidis (2011) argued by saying that the use of indirect forms increases as formality increases. Most likely, the students in the current context did not think that e-mailing their teacher was aformal process. Generally, these results supported the findings of BlumKulka et al. (1985) and Ervin Trip (1982) who worked with children and found that children resort to more indirect forms while talking to strangers and people in adominant position compared to the people they know well.

In contrary, the studies conducted by Hartford and Bardovi (1996), Biesenbach-Lucas and Weasenforth (2000) and Chen (2001), however, support the findings of the present study in that the NNS students do not seem to recognize the different status compared to the NSs.Bloch (2001) and Biesenbach-Lucas (2005) and Danielewics-Betz (2013) had also come to the conclusion that NNS students were not quite aware of the fact that their e-mails were to be read by some body in adominent position, thus were not quite successful in using the appropriate elements in their e-mails,which was also seen in this study .

 Although this study did not focus on the differnces between the native and non-native speakers of English, it is still important to note the results regarding the non-native speakers. The findings form the studies of Chang and Hsu (1998), House and Kasper (1987) Economidou-Kogestidis (2001) and Felix-Brasedefer (2012) further support the present study in that second language learners in all studies make use of direct strategies. However Felix-Brasedefer (2007) found that the level of proficiency

determines the directness of the uttetnce, which was not seen in the present study. The reason for this can be supported with the results of Biesenbach-Lucas (2007), who found that the level of imposion has agreat impact on the directness of the utterance. In other words, as the imposition was not of higher one, the students in the present study might have felt the need of use direct streategies more .If there had been requests of higher impostion; there could have been some difffernce in terms of directness. The results of mmerrison et al (2012) unfortunately cannot be used in acomparison because the participats in that study are native speakers of English, which is not the case in this study.

5.2.2 Research Question

2- What is the Role of Learners' Native Language Transfer in Performing the Speech Act of Request Email?

In order to answer the second question, the researcher demonstrated the responses of participants by identifying the results of baseline groups with the results of the analysis of IL group (IPGSs) in terms of pragmatic transfer which was noticed according to the level of three main categories namely, direct request, conventionally indirect and non–Conventionally indirect of head act. As result from the distributions of request strategies that the pragmatic transfer of IL group (IPGSs) most preferred to use conventionally indirect request level which is similar to English baseline group in term of level of directness that are more common in most of the situations which is related to the norms and customs of their L2 it can be as consider as positive evidence of pragmatic transfer for postgraduate students in EFL international instituted context.

Subsequently, the positive evidence here is that the students from IPGS and BENS groups have tended to use more politeness devices with indirect request strategies so as to mitigate or intensify the effect of their requestive strategies. So there are greater positive transfers than negative transfers. As well as direct request strategies are prominently less preferred by postgraduate students which are similar to Iraqi Arab baseline group in term of level of directness in few situations, it is similar to IANS group's used which is related to the norms and customs of their L1 it can be as consider as negative evidence of pragmatic transfer for postgraduate students in EFL international instituted context.Finally the overall data of the IL group (IPGSs) showed that even when they choose in some cases of the sub-categories of E.mail request strategies.

The head acts were concerned, 'want statements' as a negative preparatory strategy may have also resulted from the pragmatic transfer. 'Want statement' took the highest percentage (51%) as the most preferred sub-category of the direct request strategy, and preparatory negative strategy was used by IPGSs emails (compared with BENSs messages). Regarding the occurrence of pragmatic transfer in the requests of the IL group (IPGSs) in terms of the frequency of semantic formulas, 'Want statement' the IL group (IPGSs) were resembled with their L1 performance.

Based on Kasper's (1992) definition of pragmatic transfer, it can present enough evidence of this kind of transfer. Therefore, the hypothesis of Beebe and Takahashi (1987), which holds that transfer increases as L2 learners' proficiency increases (i.e., the transfer is greater among higher proficiency L2 learners than among lower proficiency L2 learners) was not supported in this study. Some other researchers

explained this because of learners' limited L2 knowledge, which prevented them transfer, their L1 conventions. It is hard to study ILP only focusing on the pragmatic transfer because some other factors also influence the learning process.

Olshtain (1983) and Robinson (1992) reported that learners tended to transfer their L1 knowledge when they obtain a Universalist view as opposed to a relativist perspective on pragmatic norms (cited in Kasper & Rose, 1999). And Takaskashi (1996) claimed learners' transferability interacted with the degree of the different requestive goal. She also stated the EFL class did not provide enough opportunities for developing pragmalinguistic awareness in L2. EFL classes usually focus on promoting learner's grammar proficiency and neglect to provide the pragmatics knowledge. This is common phenomenon since they have limited time and teaching resources, and they have to pass the English tests which usually irrelative with the pragmatics knowledge.

On the other hand, this research agreed with previous research agrees that has found that want statements are used by less advanced learners or in situations when learners felt the request was urgent (Chen, 2006). As far as the positive preparatory strategy is concerned, the most frequently used positive preparatory phrase ('Could you') is a conventional request in English. While its use in Iraq students may have resulted from the positive transfer, it is also possible that the positive preparatory strategy is a feature of the learners' interlanguage that resulted from incomplete acquisition negative preparatory strategy, a highly conventionalized request strategy in Iraq.

As general that the use of DCTs showed the production and the perception of requests by Iraqipostgraduates revealed a similarity in the choice of conventionally indirect strategies and also some variation in the use of direct strategies mostly situation one (appointment) and situation three (a signature). This also validated the results obtained by Rose (1994) as American subjects used direct requests in only two situations.

5.3 Conclusions

The analysis contributed to the literature in the way it added contextual information on request formulations and how people use more common usage of the request speech act through different participating groups. The study revealed that the respondents had different preferences of strategy choice when responding to the DCTs according to the frequency of occurrence and percentage. By looking at all previous tables which presented the strategy types used in the e-mails, we can conclude that he participants significantly preferred to use more conventionally indirect strategies while making their requests. Moreover, the numbers and statistical results showed that the use of the strategies in 'Query preparatory'category was significantly higher than all the sub-categories in Direct and Indirect strategies.

By looking at the numbers of each sub-category in detail, it has been found that the dominant elements used for producing indirective speech utterances were the modals 'can/could/may' in requests made to the teachers. The participants who used the modals 'can/could/may' most probably wanted to mitigate the tone of the message in their emails. In contrary, IPGSs used direct strategy the least in their responses to the DCTs. So, the study found that the direct requests were the least preferred strategy in some situations. Whereas it was clear that the conventionally indirect strategy was

the most favorable choice for both groups, the IPGS and the BENS, it is to conclude that native English speakers consider that conventionally indirect requests are more polite than direct strategies, which are regarded as rude and oblivious.

The indirect request strategies are considered polite as they save the requesters' negative face and do not impose on their sense of self-rule. On the other hand, the IPGS group reflected in the use of positive politeness strategies and the choice of more indirect requests.Neverthless, these results and those of the CCSARP revealed that they did not correspond so closely across situations. According to the CCSARP framework, it appeared that despite cross-cultural differences, the indirect strategies have been found to be the most frequently used in the participants' cultures.

This use of indirect strategies has been conditioned with the issue of politeness and pragmatic acceptable. This means that the participants have developed an awareness of the e-politeness in the institutional emails. Moreover, the study was conducted on the Iraqi postgraduate students and can provide insights into what international students at Turkish-Cypriot universities need to be aware in order to involve within the academic discourse community and to achieve e-mail interactions with their professors successfully.

5.3 Suggestions for Further Research

The study tried to see how students prefer to use the speech acts strategies while making a request and how they make use of e-mailing in a professor–student in the academic context. Further studies could focus on the differences among levels, such as undergraduate students and postgraduate students and see how results change over these levels. More emphasis on the ideas of the participants on their own use of the language could be given, as there are not enough data regarding the ideas of learners in the present study. Additionally, a comparison can be made between the NSs and Iraqi NNSs of English regarding their use of directive speech acts to see whether there are any significant changes.

This study can be considered as a contribution to the area of linguistics and ELT by trying to see the patterns that Iraqi university students, whose proficiency levels are undergraduate students and postgraduate students, the use in emailing. It is possible for some other researchers to choose a different approach and their starting point can be the same as the one in this study. Hopefully, this study will help them to answer some of the questions that they might have regarding these issues.

 In other future studies may cover all the aspects of communications, the use of internet comes first, in particular in the wide use of the email for communication. Technology has made possible expansion in the email to include vocal and voice channels; so, a study that makes a comparison between the request voice mail and requests written emails is recommended. Furthermore, some aspects and options of the politeness strategies are almost virgin for the Iraqi research field in linguistics especially those that deal with the aspect of gender, and a study that compares

between the E-communication topics used by the female with those used by male students would shed some light on the issue. Finally, I hope the researchers do the linguistic politeness strategies of email communications that Iraqi postgraduate students use when making requests in English, and to compare these strategies with those used by the native speakers of British English in order to figure out what Iraqi students lack in their target language.

5.4 Pedagogical Implications

Although the current study is focusing mainly on the linguistic point of language, it definitely shed light on the field of English Language Teaching.Taking all the other areas and skills of language teaching such as vocabulary and listening into account, we may not safely state that e-mailing appropriately is the most important aspect of teaching. Still, as technology is becoming a closer part of our lives, appropriate e-mail communication becomes important, and thus it should be included in the syllabus. It may also into the syllabus of departmental courses. The students might need to work on emailing strategies in English for a longer period of time because it is a learned skill.

As research showed that the students mainly preferred direct strategy in e-mail communication, the importance of integrating the communication via email is clearly seen .As the students in the present study were not quite familiar with e-mail as a means of communication, it would not have been the logical idea for us to expect too much in terms of appropriate use of the elements to be found in an e-mail. Nevertheless, the need to focus on the appropriate ways of making a request or suggestion in an online platform emerges in this study.

The present study supplies with the evidence that performing the speech act of request across different academic situations and the variety of cultures and therefore it can be one of the hazardous elements of taking in the English dialect for Iraqi speaking EFL learners. This result could be attributable to the fact that although the speech act of request is universal, ways of performing it are cultural-specific.

In order to support learners to overcome pragmatic obstacles and to become pragmatically competent in English, it can be suggested that native and non- native teachers of English language employ the data gathered from native speakers of English in the present study so that they become more aware of sociocultural rules of the language use while they are teaching .As Deveci (2003) illustrates that awareness considering this factor of language is a dominant importance so even native speakers of English may ignore the pragmatic components and this may cause failure in replying the questions about the use of speech acts asked by their learners.

Moreover like some studies in the field of interlanguage common sense Harlig and Dornyei, 1998,1999; Garcia, 1996;Jung, 2002;Pearson, 2006), the consequences of this study underscore the way that with a specific end goal to be logically able in the objective dialect, dialect learners need to end up proficient about the principles of syntax as well as about social and relevant variables basic the objective dialect. Electronic communication is becoming a more common medium for bridging the wide gap of physical distance between parties involved in all interactions in general and in academic environments in particular, Iraqi EFL teachers, professors, post-graduate students, and supervisors, which should help the students to be much more aware of how to practice the electronic medium and how to do this in an effective way and appropriate manner. In order to overcome such pragmatic competence in

English, it can be suggested that the pragmatic aspects such as (norms, beliefs and customs) of the objective dialect should be incorporated into the educational module and in addition into the EFL instructor training programs.

The blend can be given by means of pedagogical methodologies, systems and syllabus of materials which consolidate the down to earth utilization of English dialect with its formal angles advance more, so as to help point of view EFL educators to wind up practically able in English, elective courses which concentrate on the field pragmatics might be offered in the instructor training programs of ESP syllabus in university level.

REFERENCES

Al-Ali, M. N., & Sahawneh, M. B. (2008). An investigation into the generic features of English requestive e-mail messages. *LSP and professional communication (2001-2008)*, *8*(2).

Al-Ammar, M. (2000). The Linguistic Strategies and Realizations of Request Behaviour in Spoken English and Arabic among Saudi Female English Majors at Riyadh College of Arts. *Unpublished MA Thesis. Riyadh: King Saudi University*.

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

Asher, N., & Lascarides, A. (2001). Indirect speech acts. *Synthese*, *128*(1-2), 183-228.

Atashaneh, N., & Izadi, A. (2011). Refusals in English and Persian: Pragmlinguistic Investigation. *Iranian EFL journal*, *7*(2), 111-119.

Austin, J. L. (1962*). How to do things with words.*1975. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing.*Oxford University Press.

Béal, C. (1994). Keeping the peace: A cross-cultural comparison of questions andrequests in Australian English and French. *Multilingua-Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, *13*(1-2), 35-58.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. S. (1996). Input in an institutional setting.*Studies inSecond Language Acquisition*, *18*(02), 171-188.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (1997). Pragmatic awareness and instructed L2 learning: An empirical investigation. In *AAAL 1997 Conference, Orlando*.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1999). Exploring the interlanguage of interlanguage pragmatics: A research agenda for acquisitional pragmatics. *Language learning*, *49*(4), 677-713.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2000). Tense and Aspect in Second Language Acquisition:Form, Meaning, and Use. *Language Learning: A Journal of Research inLanguageStudies*, *50*, 1.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence. *Grounds for*.

Baron, N. S. (2000). *Alphabet to email: How written English evolved and where it'sheading*. Routledge.

Beebe, L. M., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990).Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. *Developing communicative competence in a second language*, *5573*.

Biesenbach-Lucas, S., & Weasenforth, D. (2002b). A strategic approach toimproving "pragmatic literacy": Pre-academic ESL. *Improving Learning Strategies for Literacy: International Research Conference on First and Second Language Literacy Strategies*, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, November 2002.

Biesenbach-Lucas, S., & Weasenforth, D. (2005). Virtual office hours: Negotiationstrategies in electronic conferencing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 15*(2), 147-165.

Biesenbach-Lucas, S. (2006). Making requests in email: Do cyber-consultations entail directness? Toward conventions in a new medium.*Pragmatics and language learning*, *11*, 81-107.

Biesenbach-Lucas, S. (2007). Students writing emails to faculty: An examination of e-politeness among native and non-native speakers of English. *Language Learning& Technology*, *11*(2), 59-81.

Billmyer, K. (1990a). I really like your lifestyle: ESL Learners learning how tocompliment. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics (WPEL)*, *6*(2), 3.

Billmyer, K. (1990b) I really like your life style: ESL learners learning how to compliment. *Penn Working Papers in Educational Linguistics 6*, 31–48.

Bloch, J. (2002). Student/teacher interaction via email: The social context of Internetdiscourse. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *11*(2), 117-134.

Blum-Kulka, S., & House, J. (1989).Cross-cultural and situational variation in requestive behavior in five languages. *Cross-cultural pragmatics*, 123-154.

Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and Apologies: A Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP). *Applied linguistics*, *5*(3), 196-213.

Blum-Kulka, S., Danet, B., & Gherson, R. (1985).The language of requesting in Israeli society.In *Language and social situations* (pp. 113-139).Springer New York.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (Vol. 31). Ablex Pub.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). Investigating cross-cultural Pragmatics: an introductory review. *Blum-Kulka, et al.(Eds.), Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies. Ablex, Norwood, NJ*, 1-34.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction* (pp. 56-311). Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge university press.

Cummings, L. M. B. M. C. (1996). Natural speech act data versus writtenquestionnaire data: How data collection method affects speech act performance. *Speech Acts Across Cultures: Challenges to communication in a second language. Mouton de Gruyter*, 65-86.

Chen, C. F. E. (2001). Making E-Mail Requests to Professors: Taiwanese vs. American Students.

Chen, C. F. E. (2006). The development of e-mail literacy: From writing to peers to writing to authority figures. *Language Learning & Technology*, *10*(2), 35-55.

Chomsky, N. (1965).Aspects of theory of syntax. Cambridge, MA, itd:MassachusettsInstitute of Technology Press.

Cohen, A. D., & Olshtain, E. (1993). The production of speech acts by EFL learners. *Tesol Quarterly*, *27*(1), 33-56.

Cohen, A. D. (1996). Developing the ability to perform speech acts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *18*(02), 253-267.

Cohen, A. D. (1996). Speech acts. *Sociolinguistics and language teaching*, 383-420.

Cohen, A. D. (2008). Teaching and assessing L2 pragmatics: What can we expect from learners? *Language Teaching*, *41*(02), 213-235.

Crystal, D. (2001). *Language and the Internet*.Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (1985). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Balackwell.

Danielewicz-Betz, A. (2013).Use of e-mail in student-faculty interaction: Implications for university instruction in Germany, Saudi Arabia, and Japan.*The JALT Journal*, *9*(1), 23-57.

Davies, C. E., & Tyler, A. E. (2005). Discourse strategies in the context of Crosscultural institutional talk: Uncovering interlanguage pragmatics in theuniversity classroom. *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Exploring Institutional Talk (pp. 133Á156). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates*.

Dippold, D. (2008). Reframing one's experience: Face, identity and roles in L2 argumentative discourse. *Developing contrastive pragmatics: Interlanguage and cross-cultural perspectives*, 131-153.

Economidou-Kogetsidis, M. (2011).Please answer me as soon as possible: Pragmatic failure in non-native speakers'e-mail requests to faculty. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(13), 3193-3215.

El Shazly, A. A. E. M. (1993). *Requesting strategies in American English, Egyptian Arabic and English as spoken by Egyptian second language learners*.

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1982). Ask and it shall be given unto you: Children's requests. *Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics.Contemporary perceptions of language: Interdisciplinary dimensions*, 235-245.

Eslami-Rasekh, Z. (2005). Raising the pragmatic awareness of language Learners. *ELT journal*, *59*(3), 199-208.

Eslami, Z. R. (2010). How to develop appropriate refusal strategies. *Speech act performance: Theoretical, empirical and methodological issues*, 217-236.

Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1989). Internal and external modification in interlanguagerequest realization. *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*, *221247*.

Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of pragmatics*, *14*(2), 219-236.

Fukuya, Y. J., & Clark, M. K. (2001). A Comparison of Input Enhancement and Explicit Instruction of Mitigators. *Online Submission*.

Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2008). *Politeness in Mexico and the United States: A contrastive study of the realization and perception of refusals* (Vol. 171). John Benjamins Publishing.

Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated recall methodology in secondlanguage research*. Routledge.

Gains, J. (1999). Electronic mail—A new style of communication or just a new medium?: An investigation into the text features of e-mail. *English for specific purposes*, *18*(1), 81-101.

Goffman, E. (1955). On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. *Psychiatry*, *18*(3), 213-231.

Grice, H. P., Cole, P., & Morgan, J. L. (1975). Syntax and semantics. *Logic and conversation*, *3*, 41-58.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies* (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.

Hartford, B. S., & Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1996). Experimental and Observational Data in the Study of Interlanguage Pragmatics. *Pragmatics and language learning*, *3*,33-52.

Hassani, R., Mardani, M., & Dastjerdi, H. V. (2011). A comparative study of refusals: Gender distinction and social status in focus. *The International Journal-Language Society and Culture*, *32*, 37-46.

Hassall, T. (2001). Modifying requests in a second language. *IRAL*, *39*(4), 259-284.

Hassall, T. (2008). Pragmatic performance: What are learners thinking?*Investigating pragmatics in foreign language learning, teaching and testing*, 72-93.

Herring, S. C. (2004). Slouching toward the ordinary: Current trends in computer-mediated communication. *New media & society*, *6*(1), 26-36.

Hymes,D.H.(1966).Twotypes of linguistic relativity. *Sociolinguistics*, *13156*.

Hendriks, B. (2010). An experimental study of native speaker perceptions of non-native request modification in e-mails in English. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *7*(2),221-255.

Holtgraves, T. M. (2013). *Language as social action: Social psychology and Language use*. Psychology Press.

House, J., & Kasper, G. (1987). Interlanguage pragmatics: Requesting in a foreignlanguage. *Perspectives on language in performance*, *2*, 1250-1288.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. *Sociolinguistics*, *269293*, 269-293.

Inglis, J., & Lawson, J. S. (1984). Sex differences in the effects of unilateral brain damage on intelligence. *Science*, *212*(4495), 693-695.

Jordà, M. P. S. (2004). An analysis on EAP learners' pragmatic production: a focus on request forms. *Ibérica: Revista de la Asociación Europea de Lenguas para Fines Específicos (AELFE)*, (8), 23-39.

Kankaanranta, A. (2005). "Hej Seppo, could you pls comment on this!": internal email communication in lingua franca English in a multinational company.

Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. *Second language research*, *8*(3), 203-231.

Kasper, G., & Schmidt, R. (1996). Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in second language acquisition*, *18*(02), 149-169.

Kasper, G. (1997). The role of pragmatics in language teacher education.*Beyond methods: Components of language teacher education*, 113-136.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (1999). Pragmatics and SLA. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, *19*, 81-104.

Kasper, G., & Roever, C. (2005). Pragmatics in second language learning.*Handbookof research in second language teaching and learning*, *1*, 317-334.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). Pragmatic Development in a Second Language. *Language Learning: A Journal of Research in Language Studies*, *52*, 1.

Kasper, G., &Zhang, Y. (1995). *It's good to be a bit Chinese*. Pragmatics of Chineseas native and target language, 1-24.

Kormos, J. (1998). Verbal reports in L2 speech production research. *TESOL Quarterly*, *32*(2), 353-358.

Lee-Wong, S. M. (1994). Imperatives in requests: direct or impolite—observations from Chinese. *Pragmatics*, *4*(4), 491-515.

Lee, C. F. (2004). Written requests in emails sent by adult Chinese learners of English. *Language Culture and Curriculum*, *17*(1), 58-72.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragrnatics.* London & New York Longman.

Marriot, H. E. (1995). Deviations in an intercultural business negotiation.Discourse of negotiation. *Studies of language in the workplace*, 247-267.

Miller, L. (1995). Two aspects of Japanese and American co-worker interaction: Giving instructions and creating rapport. *The Journal of applied behavioral science*, *31*(2), 141-161.

Murray, D. E. (2014). *Knowledge machines: Language and information in a technological society*. Routledge.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social motivations for codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. Cambridge University Press.

Olshtain, E. (1989).Apologies across languages. *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*, *155173*.

Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. (1989). Speech act behavior across languages.*Transferin language production*, *53*, 67.

Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. (1990). The learning of complex speech act behaviour. *TESL Canada Journal*, *7*(2), 45-65.

Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. (1983). Apology: A speech act set. *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition*, 18-35.

Olshtain, E. (1983). Sociocultural competence and language transfer: The case of apology. *Language transfer in language learning*, 232-249.

Reiter, R. M. (2000). *Linguistic politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A contrastive study of requests and apologies* (Vol. 83). John Benjamins Publishing.

Ren, W. (2012). Pragmatic development in Chinese speakers' L2 English refusals. *EUROSLA Yearbook*, *12*(1), 63-87.

Robinson, M. A. (1992).Introspective methodology in interlanguage pragmatics research. *Pragmatics of Japanese as native and target language*,*3*, 29-84.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (Eds.). (2001). *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.

Schmidt, R. (1993). Consciousness, learning and interlanguage pragmatics.*Interlanguage pragmatics*, *21*, 42.

Searle, J. (1965). What is a speech act? *Language and social context* (pp.136–154). Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language* (Vol. 626).Cambridge university press.

Searle, J. R. (1975). *Indirect speech acts* (pp. 59-82). Na.

Searle, J. R. (1979). Meaning and expression. *Studies in the theory of speech acts*.

Swales John, M., & Feak, C. B. (1994).Academic Writing for Graduate Students.

Sahragard, R., & Javanmardi, F. (2011). English Speech Act Realization of" Refusals" among Iranian EFL Learners/ Learlisation des actes de Discourse De 'Refus' En Anglais ParmilesArrpenntsAleIranians. *Cross-Cultural Communication*, *7*(2), 181.

Shea, V. (1994). Netiquette. San Francisco. *CA: Albion Book*.

Tagashira, K., Yamato, K., & Isoda, T. (2011). Japanese EFL learners' pragmatic awareness through the looking glass of motivational profiles. *JALT Journal*, *33*(1), 5-26.

Takahashi, S. (1996). Pragmatic transferability. *Studies in second language acquisition*, *18*(02), 189-223.

Takahashi, S. (2001).The role of input enhancement in developing pragmatic competence. *Pragmatics in language teaching*, 171-199.

Takahashi, S. (2005). Pragmalinguistic awareness: Is it related to motivation andproficiency?. *Applied Linguistics*, *26*(1), 90-120.

Takahashi, S. (2005). Noticing in task performance and learning outcomes: A qualitative analysis of instructional effects ininterlanguage pragmatics.System, *33*(3), 437-461.

Takahashi, T., & Beebe, L. M. (1987). The development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of English. *JALT journal*, *8*(2), 131-155.

Takahashi, T., & Beebe, L. M. (1993). Cross-linguistic influence in the speech act of correction. *Interlanguage pragmatics*, *138*, 158-169.

Takahashi, S. (1996). Pragmatic transferability. *Studies in second language acquisition*, *18*(02), 189-223.

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure.

Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage pragmatics: Requests, complaints, and apologies* (Vol. 7). Walter de Gruyter.

Umar, A. M. A. (2004). Request strategies as used by advanced Arab learners of English as a foreign language. *Umm Al-Qura University Journal of Educational& Social Sciences & Humanities*, *16*(1), 42-87.

Wierzbicka, A. (1985). Different cultures, different languages, different speech acts: Polish vs. English. *Journal of pragmatics*, *9*(2-3), 145-178.

Wilson, S. R., Aleman, C. G., & Leatham, G. B. (1998). Identity Implications of Influence Goals A Revised Analysis of Face-Threatening Acts and Application to Seeking Compliance With Same-Sex Friends. *Human Communication Research*, *25*(1), 64-96.

Wolfson, N. (1989).The social dynamics of native and nonnative variation in complimenting behavior.In *The dynamic interlanguage* (pp. 219-236).Springer US.

Woodfield, H., & Economidou-Kogetsidis, M. (2010). 'I just need more time': A study of native and non-native students' requests to faculty for an extension.

Worrells, D. S. (2002). Asynchronous Distance Learning: E-mail Attachments Used as the Medium for Assigned Coursework. *Atea journal*, *29*(2), 4-6.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: ConcertForm

Dear students,

Iam doing MA degree in English language teaching Department at Eastern Mediterranean University. Iam carrying out a study, which aims to investigate the request strategies used by Iraqi postgraduate students in universities of Northern Cypruswhile performing the speech act of request by email to fill out DCT carefully and accurately. Your answers will be kept confidential and used for research purposes only.

Thank you very much for you cooperation and help.

Ghazwan Aljanabi

MA student

Faculty of Education

English Language Teaching Department

mutarg@yahoo.com

CONSENT FORM

I have read and understand the purpose of the study and how my responses will be used.

Therefore, I agree to participate in this study.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix B: Background Information

Please take your time answering the following questions, and be as honest as possible. Your answers will not be correlated with your name. Your email address will be removedfrom the questionnaire by the researcher who will assign your responses a randomnumber.

_____

1. Gender: (circle one) Female Male

2. Age: (circle one) 18-25 26-35 36-45 45+

3. What language do you speak with your parents?

_____

4. What language do you consider to be your native language?

_____

5. What foreign languages have your studied?

Language Circle your level of proficiency

basic intermediate advanced

basic intermediate advanced

basic intermediate advanced

basic intermediate advanced

Appendix C: Discourse Completion Test

Written Discourse Completion Test

Please complete these tasks.

Thank you for your participation and support!

1-You want to meet with Professor X to talk about your project. You are writing an email to him/her to make an appointment. What would you say in this email?

2-You are writing an email inviting Professor X (whom you had a course with during the last semester) to be your committee member. What would you say in the email?

3-You are registering courses for next semester on EMU, but there is no vacant spot left for one course that you plan to take. Therefore, you cannot register that course through EMU system. Professor X is the instructor of that course and this is the first course you are taking with him. You are writing an email to him/her and asking for help. What would you say in this email?

4-You need a signature from Professor X (your chair) for your degree plan. You are writing an email to him/her. What would you say in this email?

5-This semester, you are taking one course from Professor X. You are writing an email to Professor X to remind him/her to update related files/notes/papers of that course on ELearning. What would you say in this email?

Appendix D: Concert Form (Arabic Version)

اعزائي الطلبة

انا اكمل دراستي في تخصص اللغه الانكليزيه في كليه التربيه جامعة شرق البحر الابيض المتوسط . هدفي من الدراسه لاختبار اساليب الطلبات عبر البريد الاكتروني المستخدمه من قبل الطلبه العراقيه في جامعات قبرص التركية . الرجاء الاجابه عن اسئلة هذا الاختبار بعنايه وبدقه.والاجابات ستحفظ ولن تستخدم إلا لأغراض البحث.

شكرا لكم حسن تعاونكم ومساعدتكم

غزوان الجنابي

طالب ماجستير

كلية التربية

قسم تعليم اللغة الانجليزية

mutarg@yahoo.com

نموذج الموافقة

لقد قرأت وفهمت الغرض من الدراسة وكيف سيتم استخدام إجاباتي

لذلك أنا أوافق على المشاركة في هذه الدراسة

التوقيع: _____

التاريخ:_____

Appendix E: Background Information (Arabic Version)

يرجى خذ وقتك في الإجابة على الأسئلة التالية بمصداقيه قدر الإمكان

إجاباتك ستكون غير مرتبطة مع اسمك. سيتم إزالة عنوان البريد الإلكتروني الخاص بك

من الاستبيان من قبل الباحث الذي سيتم ترميز الاجابات بنظام ارقام عشوائية.

_____

1-الجنس: (دائرة واحدة) أنثى ذكر .

2-العمر: (دائرة واحدة) 18 25 26 35 36 45 45

3-ما هي اللغة التي تتكلم بها مع والديك؟ .

_____

4-ما هي اللغة التي تعتقد أنها لغتك الأم؟

_____

5-ما هي اللغات الأجنبية التي درستها ؟

دائرة على مستواك من الكفاءة

أساسي متوسط متقدم

أساسي متوسط متقدم

أساسي متوسط متقدم

أساسي متوسط متقدم

Appendix F: Discourse Completion Test (Arabic Version)

يرجى إكمال هذه النصوص

شكرا لك على المشاركة والدعم

1 ترغب أن تتقابل مع الاستاذ للحديث عن المشروع. تكتب رسالة بريد إلكتروني له لتحديد موعد. ماذا تقول

في هذه الرسالة؟

2 تكتب بريد الكتروني لدعوة الاستاذ الذي سبق وان اخذت كورس معه الفصل الدراسي الماضي ليكومن عظو

في لجنة المناقشه

ماذا تقول في هذه الرسالة؟

3 ترغب ان تسجل مواد للفصل الدراسي المقبل في جامعة شرق البحر الابيض المتوسط ولكن ليس هناك مجال

متروك للكورس الذي خططت ان تاخذه.بالرغم من ان لايمكنك التسجيل عن طريق النظام الاكتروني للجامعه.

استاذ تلك الماده انت لاول مره تاخذ معه. تكتب رسالة بريد إلكتروني له / لها، وتطلب المساعدة. ماذا تقول في

هذه الرسالة؟

4 تحتاج توقيع من الاستاذ لخطت بحث تكتب رسالة بريد إلكتروني له / لها، وتطلب المساعدة. ماذا تقول في

هذه الرسالة؟

5 هذا الفصل الدراسي اخذت مادة مع الاستاذ. تكتب بريد الكتروني الى الاستاذ تذكره بتحديث الملفات

والاوراق ذات الصله بالماده في التعليم الاكتروني. ماذا تقول في هذه الرساله الاكترونية.