

**PRAGMATIC TRANSFER OF DIRECT AND
INDIRECT DISCOURSE STRATEGIES: A
STUDY OF PASHTU AND SARAIKI SPEAKING
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS**

BY

MUHAMMAD FAROOQ ALAM



NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF MODERN LANGUAGES

ISLAMABAD

May, 2021

**Pragmatic Transfer of Direct and Indirect Discourse Strategies:
A Study of Pashtu and Saraiki Speaking English Language
Learners**

By

MUHAMMAD FAROOQ ALAM

M.Phil. Air University, Islamabad, 2015

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In English

TO

FACULTY OF ENGLISH STUDIES



NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF MODERN LANGUAGES, ISLAMABAD

© Muhammad Farooq Alam, 2021



THESIS AND DEFENSE APPROVAL FORM

The undersigned certify that they have read the following thesis, examined the defense, are satisfied with the overall exam performance, and recommend the thesis to the Faculty of Languages for acceptance:

Thesis Title: Pragmatic Transfer of Direct and Indirect Discourse Strategies: A Study of Pashtu and Saraiki Speaking English Language Learners

Submitted By: Muhammad Farooq Alam

Registration #: 597-PhD/Eng/S-16

Doctor of Philosophy

Degree Name in Full

English Linguistics

Name of Discipline

Dr. Aneela Gill

Name of Research Supervisor

Signature of Research Supervisor

Dr. Sighat Ullah Khan

Name of Dean

Signature of Dean

Prof. Dr. Muhammad Safeer Awan

Name of Pro-Rector Academics

Signature of Pro-Rector Academics

Date

CANDIDATE'S DECLARATION

I, Muhammad Farooq Alam

Son of Umar Khan

Registration #597-PhD/Eng/S 16

Discipline English Linguistics

Candidate of **Doctor of Philosophy** at the National University of Modern Languages do hereby declare that the thesis: **Pragmatic Transfer of Direct and Indirect Discourse Strategies: A Study of Pashtu and Saraiki Speaking English Language Learners** submitted by me in partial fulfillment of PhD degree, is my original work, and has not been submitted or published earlier. I also solemnly declare that it shall not, in future, be submitted by me for obtaining any other degree from this or any other university or institution.

I also understand that if evidence of plagiarism is found in my thesis/dissertation at any stage, even after the award of a degree, the work may be cancelled and the degree revoked.

Signature of Candidate

Muhammad Farooq Alam
Name of Candidate

Date

ABSTRACT

Title: Pragmatic Transfer of Direct and Indirect Discourse Strategies: A Study of Pashtu and Saraiki Speaking English Language Learners

Throughout the short life of interlanguage pragmatics as a sub discipline of second language research, it has always been perceived as an assumption that non-native speakers' reliance on the L1 pragmatic knowledge influences in the process of learning L2. This research study aims at discovering the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer among multilingual and multicultural background learners' who rely on the linguistic and cultural resources of their mother tongue in using English. The transfer from L1 into L2 is executed through direct and indirect discourse strategies during the accomplishments of tasks in the target language. A mixed-methods research paradigm grounded in interlanguage pragmatics is used as a research method. The data has been obtained through three data collection tools, viz. written discourse completion tasks, oral role plays and semi-structured interviews. The participants' responses were compared to the cultural norms of L1 for identifying the instances of pragmatic transfer from L1 to L2 during data analysis. Based on Kasper's (1992) framework, this study investigates the performance of three speech acts: request, refusal and apology by Pashtu and Saraiki English language learners focusing on the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer. The study focuses underlie to contribute to a research area which is less explored in the context of English as L2 in Pakistan. The findings reveal many areas of cross-cultural variability in the accomplishment of the selected speech acts. Moreover, sociopragmatic transfer is evidenced in learners' perception of situational variables and the evaluation of contexts which resemble, to a great extent, those of the mother culture. Furthermore, discourse strategies executed either direct or indirect in apologies, refusals and requests testify to the mother culture's influence. Based on the findings, this study also proposed implications of the teaching of pragmatics in the English as a second language (ESL) context.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
THESIS AND DEFENSE APPROVAL FORM.....	ii
CANDIDATE’S DECLARATION.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	x
DEDICATION.....	xii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xiii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xv
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Introduction to the Study	1
1.2 Definitions of Key Terms	2
1.3 Background of the Study	4
1.4 Statement of the Problem	7
1.5 Research Objectives.....	8
1.6 Research Questions.....	8
1.7 Theoretical Framework.....	8
1.8 Mixed-Methods Research Paradigm.....	10
1.9 Data Analysis	12
1.10 Significance of the Study.....	13
1.11 Delimitations.....	14
1.11 Organization of the Study.....	14
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	16
2.1 Emergence of Pragmatic Transfer and its Development	16
2.1.1 Transfer and its Integration into Language Transfer	17

2.1.2	Prgamtic Transfer in Relevance to Language Trannsfer	21
2.1.3	Pragmalinguistic vs. Socipragmatic Transfer	23
2.1.4	Negative Pragmalinguistic Transfer vs. Negative Sociopragmatic Transfer.....	26
2.1.5	Positive Transfer	28
2.1.6	Negative Transfer	30
2.1.7	Indicators of Pragmatic Transfer	33
2.2	Direct and Indirect Discourse Strategies	36
2.3	Brief Survey of Avaliable Research on the Interlanguage Studies	42
2.3.1	Studies on Speech Acts	42
2.3.2	Studies on Speech Act of Apology	44
2.3.3	Studies on Speech Act of Request	47
2.3.4	Studies on Speech Act of Refusal.....	51
2.3.5	Studies on Interlanguage.....	53
2.3.6	Studies on Interlanguage Pragmatics	55
2.4	Pashtu Language and Culture	59
2.5	Saraiki Language and Culture	61
2.6	Gap in the Existing Literature in Pakistani ESL Classroom Context	62
2.7	Summary.....	64
3.	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	66
3.1	Theoretical Framework	67
3.2	Research Setting	68
3.3	Research Methods in Interlanguage Pragmatics	69
3.4	Mixed-Method Research Paradigm	70
3.5	Rationale for the Selection of Research Instruments.....	72

3.5.1 Discourse Completion Tasks (DCTs)	73
3.5.2 Oral Open Role Plays	74
3.5.3 Semi-structured Interviews.....	75
3.6 Variables of the Study	76
3.7 Data Analysis	77
3.7.1 Analysis of Written Discourse Completion Tasks (WDCTs)	78
3.7.2 Analysis of Oral Open Role Plays	79
3.7.3 Analysis of Semi-structured Interviews	81
3.8 Sample of the Study.....	82
3.8.1 Participants of the Study	83
3.8.2 Time Duration of the Study	83
3.9 Pilot Study.....	83
3.10 Ethical Considerations.....	84
3.11 Transcription Conventions	84
3.12 Rationale for the Selection of the Speech Acts	85
3.13 Summary	87
4. DATA ANALYSIS-I.....	88
4.1 Speech Act: Apology	88
4.1.1 Apology: Situation 1.....	88
4.1.2 Apology: Situation 2	93
4.1.3 Apology: Situation 3	95
4.2 Speech Act: Request	99
4.2.1 Request: Situation 1	99
4.2.3 Request: Situation 2.....	103
4.2.3 Request: Situation 3.....	108

4.3	Speech Act: Refusal	112
4.3.1	Refusal: Situation 1	112
4.3.2	Refusal: Situation 2	117
4.3.3	Refusal: Situation 3	121
4.4	Summary	125
5.	DATA ANALYSIS-II	127
5.1	Speech Act: Apology.....	127
5.1.1	Apology: Situation 1	127
5.1.2	Apology: Situation 2.....	131
5.1.3	Apology: Situation 3.....	132
5.2	Speech Act: Request	134
5.2.1	Request: Situation 1	134
5.2.2	Request: Situation 2	139
5.2.3	Request: Situation 3	142
5.3	Speech Act: Refusal.....	146
5.3.1	Refusal: Situation 1	146
5.3.2	Refusal: Situation 2	149
5.3.3	Refusal: Situation 3.....	153
5.4	Summary	157
6.	DATA ANALYSIS-III.....	159
6.1	Analysis of Semi-structured Interviews	159
6.1.1	Theme of Sociocultural Assumptions for the Speech Act of Apology.....	160
6.1.2	Theme of Learning through Sociopragmatic Transfer	163
6.2	Theme of Sociocultural Assumptions for the Speech Act of Request.....	170

6.2.1 Theme of Learning through Sociopragmatic Transfer	172
6.3 Theme of Sociocultural Assumptions for the Speech Acts of Refusal.....	173
6.3.1 Theme of Learning through Sociopragmatic Transfer	174
6.4 Summary	176
7. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION.....	177
7.1 Findings of the Study.....	177
7.1.1 Findings from WDCTs.....	179
7.1.2 Findings from Oral Open Role Plays.....	181
7.1.3 Findings from Semi-structured Interviews:	182
7.2 Differences in Communication Strategies between Pashtu and Saraiki Cultures.....	185
7.3 Data Triangulation	187
7.3 Discussion	188
7.4 Summary.....	192
8. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	194
8.1 Conclusion.....	197
8.2 Recommendations for Teaching English as a Second/Foreign Language.....	198
8.3 Recommendations for English Language Learners	199
8.4 Limitations of the Study and Recommendations for Future Research.....	199
REFERENCES	202-225
APPENDICES	226-238

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I offer all praise to Almighty Allah, the Cherisher and the Sustainer of mankind, who blessed me with the vision, and patience to pursue my studies, and I am grateful to Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him), the Educator of all times, whose footprints provide the guidance to seek knowledge throughout one's life.

I owe heartfelt gratitude to Dr. Muhammad Safeer Awan, Pro-Rector, National University of Modern Languages, Dr. Sibghat Ullah Khan, Dean, Faculty of English Studies, and Dr. Arshad Mehmood, the then head of the Department for their cooperation during the entire process of my doctoral research.

I owe earnest thanks to my supervisor Dr. Aneela Gill for her faith in me and trust in my ability to carry this research in the area of pragmatics. She combines the qualities of an exceptional teacher, a true researcher and an amiable person. Working with her proved to be a great learning experience for me. During the entire process, she has made several telephonic calls as a reminder to muster up my courage, motivation and enabling me to accomplish the task. I am indebted to her for her guidance, support and encouragement throughout this strenuous journey.

I would be unjust if I didn't mention those big names, like, Dr. Muhammad Uzair, Dr. Farheen Ahmad Hashmi, Dr. Nighat Sultana, Dr. Jameel Asghar and Dr. Ghazala Kausar, who taught me, provided me guidance whenever I knocked at their door. I would also like to extend my thanks to Dr. Sayeda Juwairiyya Mobeen for assistance in the last phase of formatting of the draft. I would also extend my thanks to Dr. Hazrat Umar for his counseling and guidance. I owe much respect and thanks to Dr. Shahida for her moral support and instilling in me the spirit for pursuing my studies. I express thanks to Dr. Arshad (Coordinator, PhD programme) for their help in formatting several drafts of the thesis. Indeed. I am thankful to Dr. Rooh ul Amin, being colleague and friend helped me a lot during different phases especially in the analysis chapter and proof reading of the draft. I am thankful to Dr. Bakhtiar Khattak, Dean, Faculty of Arts and the then Head of English department at Gomal University for granting me study leave without which I would not have been able to carry out this study.

I am grateful to my brother-in-law (Muhammad Imran) and sister-in-law (Farhat Shamim) who made my stay possible in Islamabad during my course work. I owe special thanks to Shahid Masood (an office bearer) for his extended cooperation in the process. I

also extend my thanks to my friends and classmates for their motivation, encouragement and kind wishes.

I would like to express my deepest love to my late Dad Mr. Umar Khan who in spite of being a cancer patient always inspired and encouraged my pursuit of higher studies. Would that he was alive today! It was my father's dream that one of his sons should have a Ph.D. So, with the completion of this work, I feel proud to have made his dream come true. I am also indebted to my mother for her support in overcoming the different phases of this accomplishment. I am also thankful to my siblings for their support and strength during the entire process of this study.

I am also thankful to my wife who gave me all of her savings and did not demand anything during this long period of study. Moreover, it was her wish for me to have a PhD and indeed, she motivated me and proved herself a driving force in the completion of this project. I would like to thank my two daughters and a son. It was their love and sense of responsibility which helped me rather compelled me in subtle ways to overcome all the difficulties. Without their patience, support and understanding, this thesis would not have been a possibility.

DEDICATION

Dedicated to my late father Umar Khan for his love, Dad! You are not away but in my every breath, and to my mother. This thesis is also dedicated earnestly to my caring wife, and my Children, Salaar Farooq, Adina Farooq and Ayesha Farooq.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CAH	Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis
CC	Communicative Competence
CC	Creative Construction
CCSARP	Cross-culture Speech Acts Realization Project
CI	Conventionally Indirect
CLI	Cross linguistic Influence
CUP	Common Underlying Proficiency
DCTs	Discourse Completion Tasks
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ELL	English Language Learners
ESL	English as a Second Language
EXP	Explanation
FL	Foreign Language
FLA	First Language Acquisition
FSA	Face Saving Act
FTA	Face Threatening Act
GU DIK	Gomal University, Dera Ismail Khan
H	Hearer
HA	Head Act
IFID	Illocutionary Force Initiative Device
ILP	Interlanguage Pragmatics
KPK	Khyber Pakhtunkhwa
L1	First Language
L2	Second Language
NCI	Non-conventionally Indirect
NESC	Native English-Speaking Country
NL	Native Language
NNS	Non-native Speakers
PSELL	Pashtu Speaking English Language Learner
QP	Query Preparatory
REP	Repair
S	Speaker

SSELL	Saraiki Speaking English Language Learner
SL	Second Language
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
TESOL	Teaching of English to Speaker of Other Languages
TL	Target Language
UG	Universal Grammar
WDCTs	Written Discourse Completion Tasks

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1. Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 1 for Apology.....	88
Table 4.2. Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 2 for Apology.....	93
Table 4.3. Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 3 for Apology.....	96
Table 4.4. Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 1 for Request.....	99
Table 4.5. Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 2 for Request.....	104
Table 4.6. Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 3 for Request.....	109
Table 4.7. Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 1 for Refusal.....	112
Table 4.8. Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 2 for Refusal.....	117
Table 4.9. Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 3 for Refusal.....	121
Table 5.1. Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 1 for Apology.....	128
Table 5.2. Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 2 for Apology.....	131
Table 5.3. Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 3 for Apology.....	133
Table 5.4. Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 1 for Request.....	135

Table 5.5. Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 2 for Request.....	139
Table 5.6. Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 3 for Request.....	143
Table 5.7. Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 1 for Refusal.....	147
Table 5.8. Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 2 for Refusal.....	150
Table 5.9. Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 3 for Refusal.....	154

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction to the Study

Language is regarded as a natural ability of humans and a communicative trait of any language user. It is also a cultural phenomenon as the norms associated with languages differ in different communication settings across cultures. Variations in cultural norms of languages may pose a difficulty to the learners of a new language. Such difficulties faced by non-native speakers might be occurring due to the interference of their first language or its culture. However, learners' reliance upon their mother tongue's cultural and linguistic resources may create either a difficulty or ease in achieving desired proficiency in the target language. Due to this reliance on mother tongue resources, English language learners may encounter pragmatic challenges if asked to accomplish a communicative task in the target language. The current study investigates the integration of mother tongue cultural values as employed by Pashtu and Saraiki speakers during the accomplishment of speech acts in the target language.

This study focuses on Pashtu and Saraiki English language learners in a Pakistani university's classroom. Belonging to diverse cultures and languages, these learners tend to rely on cultural and linguistic resources of their mother tongue, which are incorporated into their target language output. Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993) demonstrated that divergence across cultures and languages is likely to result in communication failures when learners communicate with native speakers. The same may happen when such learners communicate with high proficiency second language users of English. This phenomenon necessitates the investigation of cross-cultural communicative practices in Pakistani university settings by focusing on speech differences in two or more languages or cultures. The current study also investigates communicative practices of Pashtu and Saraiki speakers learning English in a cross-cultural setting.

Non-native speakers' tendency to deviate from the underlying rules and norms of the target language when producing speech or writing in a second language has been acknowledged in the realm of pragmatics as pragmatic transfer. The present study focuses on the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer among Pashtu and Saraiki English language learners. The study will also take into account the fact that

pragmatic transfer may result in either facilitation or hindrance for learners in achieving a desired proficiency in the target language. Pragmatic transfer and all the terms relevant to this study have been introduced in the next section.

1.2 Definitions of the Key Terms

The following terms are crucial to the study and need to be defined before establishing a background of this study.

Speech Acts: Austin (1975) defines a speech act as a linguistic action accomplished through the use of an utterance with a purpose in mind to communicate. In order to accomplish a speech act, a situation must comprise of a speaker, a hearer, and an utterance by the speaker. By doing so, several kinds of acts can be associated with the single utterance of a speaker. Speech acts are classified as: statement, assertion, description, warning, comment, command, order, request, criticism, apology, agreement, welcome, promise, and expression of regret.

Transfer: Upon the definition of the term transfer in language, Odlin (1989, p. 27) acknowledges that transfer is an outcome of already acquired L1 knowledge and rests on the linguistic and cultural resemblances and variances between the target language and the mother tongue(s). The study of transfer might take the form of errors known as negative transfer, or it might be identified as positive transfer, in other words, escaping from the forms of target language or their over-use.

Pragmatics: Levinson (1983) encompasses the idea of pragmatics as fundamentally related to the study of meaning conveyed by a speaker. It basically tries to explain what could be the objective of a speaker behind an utterance in a specific context and how the said context affects what is said. Pragmatics is, thus, the study centered on the investigation of speakers' intended meaning.

Pragmatic Transfer: Pragmatic transfer has been identified as sociolinguistic transfer (Wolfson, 1989) that shows cross-linguistic influence or transfer of L1 sociocultural competence (Beebe et al., 1990).

Pragmalinguistic and Sociopragmatic Transfer: Leech (1983) divided pragmatic transfer into two corresponding types, which are: pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatic transfer. Thomas (1983) defined pragmalinguistics transfer as "the inappropriate transfer of speech act strategies from one language to another" (as cited in Kasper, 1992). In addition, defining sociopragmatic transfer, he writes, "sociopragmatic transfer, then, is operative when the social perceptions underlying

language users' interpretation and performance of linguistic action in L2 are influenced by their assessment of subjectively equivalent L1 contexts" (Kasper, 1992, p. 209).

Positive and Negative Transfer: Keeping the corresponding notions of transfer into consideration, Odlin (1989) demonstrated that positive transfer has always positive effects on learning in terms of similarities in two languages. On the other hand, negative transfer follows when two languages fall apart and have some great differences. Therefore, the former proves helpful in creating an ease in learning, while the negative transfer hampers the competence in learning. In other words, negative transfer is an interference of the first language (L1). By then, it was purported that negative transfer was an outcome of L1 knowledge that influenced learners during the learning process of L2.

Direct and Indirect Discourse Strategies: A speech act is often viewed as direct if its Head Act is compatible with one of the direct strategies on the scale, and indirect, if its Head Act corresponds with one of the indirect strategies on the scale. Direct refers to the approval or denial in a direct manner while indirect is still an approval or denial but the speaker wishes not to offend the hearer. Drawing on this taxonomy, Salazar (2013) presented semantic formulas for classifying direct strategies into two subtypes: i) bluntness, which is the direct use of a "no" or the use of a performative verb, and ii) negation of proposition, which encompasses expressions that convey denials. In addition, indirect strategies are categorized into seven main subtypes: i) plain indirect, which indicates those expressions that alleviate the refusal; ii) reason or explanation, an inability to comply with the request; iii) regret or apology, feelings of being offended; iv) alternative, suggesting an alternative; v) disagreement, dissuasion or criticism; vi) statement of principle or philosophy, indicators of moral beliefs; and vii) avoidance, non-verbal avoidance and verbal avoidance.

Interlanguage: The word interlanguage was presented by Selinker (1972, p. 209-232) who defined the term as "a separate linguistic system based on the observable output which results from a learner's attempted production of a target Language norm". Kasper and Dahl (1991) defined the term interlanguage pragmatics (henceforth, ILP) which refers to the potential or ability of the non-native speakers to understand and produce speech acts, and the ways the learners of L2 acquire pragmatic knowledge of L2.

Interlanguage Pragmatics: Kasper and Schmidt (1996) asserted that ILP primarily focuses on the usage of language related to the production or comprehension in terms of the learner's interlanguage from a pragmatic transfer standpoint and the procedure that takes place during the acquisition of the pragmatic knowledge of the target language.

1.3 Background of the Study

As mentioned earlier, the present study examines the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer among Pashtu and Saraiki English language learners. This study also aims to investigate the phenomenon of sociopragmatic transfer that occurs due to the influence of socio-cultural norms of mother tongue, which are transferred into the target language. Learners' reliance on the linguistic and cultural resources of mother tongue might create either an ease or difficulty in the production of speech or writing in the target language (henceforth, TL. I have used L2 for English as second language and TL for English as target language interchangeably throughout the text of the dissertation). For example, a direct request in one language or culture might be palatable, but not in the other. In a similar vein, in one language or culture, a receiver of a refusal may respond by a non-verbal action such as a shrug, which indicates negation to request in the case of Pakistani culture. In this way, cross-cultural diversity makes the task of the second and foreign language learning very challenging. On the other hand, the occurrence of sociopragmatic transfer as a sub-type of pragmatic transfer might create a difficulty, sometimes an ease, in achieving high proficiency in the target language.

Leech (1983) classified the notion of pragmatic transfer into two broader categories identified as 'pragmalinguistics' and 'sociopragmatics', which have been identified as 'pragmatic failure' by Thomas (1983). However, Leech's distinction between two types of pragmatic transfer has been considered as an appropriate means in separating the two prominent domains of pragmatic transfer. Prior to Leech's classification (1983), pragmalinguistics was considered an aspect of mother tongue values with signified linguistic resources for the accomplishment of particular illocutions. However, in accomplishing a specific communicative act, interlocutors select from multiple existing strategies of mother tongue or any other already acquired language, which transmits the identical illocution but differs in interactive meaning.

Furthermore, taking into consideration the significance of first language (henceforth, L1, which has been used for mother tongue and first language interchangeably throughout the text of the dissertation) ILP, the notion of pragmatic transfer becomes all the more important within the settings of cross-cultural pragmatics and second language acquisition (henceforth, SLA) research. In other words, ILP emerged with a view that the notion of pragmatic transfer is not compatible with the cognitive interpretation that involves the process of SLA. For the sake of clarity and convenience, Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993) identified five main areas in ILP that can be investigated, namely: (i) pragmatic comprehension; (ii) production of linguistic action; (iii) development of pragmatic competence; (iv) pragmatic transfer; and (v) communicative effect. To elaborate it further, the production of speech acts entails a tactful choice for the selection of a particular strategy underlying social perceptions of mother tongue that could convey the utterances' intent identified as illocutionary force. These strategies emulate culture-rooted conventions about the situational variations of a certain speech event concerning the age of the speakers, their status, their relationship, the formality of the situation, and the aim of the speech event whether interactional or transactional or else. Any misjudgment of the interlocutors' expectations regarding what is said and how it is said might lead to negative effects or loss. Among the above mentioned ILP areas, the present study intends to work within the framework of pragmatic transfer ascribed to Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993).

As mentioned earlier, the present study focuses on the elements of sociopragmatic transfer that is, the influence of the previously acquired cultural and linguistic resources of first language in the learning process of the target language. Moreover, this study also focuses on direct and indirect discourse strategies that Pashtu and Saraiki learners of English language adopt during the accomplishment of speech acts in the target language. In the light of this statement, the present research aims to explore sociopragmatic transfer that might occur due to an influence of mother tongue cultural norms in the accomplishment of a speech act when producing speech or writing in the target language. The present study also explores the factors influencing learners' production related to cross-linguistic or cultural differences. The present research is grounded in the framework of pragmatic transfer, which occupies a significant place in the study of pragmatic theory, and is still in vogue. The study also aims to bring to light the occurrences of apologies, requests and refusals with

reference to pragmatic transfer among Pashtu and Saraiki English language learners studying in a Pakistani university.

It is important here to discuss the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of the selected Pashtu and Saraiki English language learners. Rehman (1996) proclaims that Pakistan is a multilingual and multicultural state, where the Pakhtun, Sindhi, Balochi, Punjabi, Mohajir and Saraiki identities are constructed through Pashtu, Sindhi, Balochi, Punjabi, Urdu and Saraiki languages. Furthermore, Saraiki is an Indo-Aryan language, spoken as first language (L1) in the south-western half of the province of Punjab in Pakistan. According to Rehman (1996), Saraiki is spoken as the first language (L1) by 20 million people in Pakistan, extending upon southern Punjab, southern Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, and border regions of northern Sindh and eastern Baluchistan. People belonging to the areas such as Bahawalpur, DG Khan, Multan, Sargodha and Dera Ismail Khan use Saraiki as their first language. In this connection, Asif and Imtiaz (2005) proposed that Saraiki is to a large extent mutually intelligible with Standard Punjabi as the two languages share a large portion of their vocabulary and morphology with each other. According to them, apart their linguistic similarities with Punjabi, Saraiki people are different from Punjabis in terms of their food habits, dress, folk dances, games, amusements, mindset and psyche. They have further observed that Saraiki speakers have a great love for their native land and are often found unwilling to leave their birth place as opposed to Punjabis and Pashtuns. They further maintained that Saraiki speakers are submissively objective in presenting their view or giving their judgment. A few archetypal examples of Saraiki are; *Jhoomer* (A type of cultural dance), *betak* (Get together).

On the other hand, Rehman (1996) demonstrated that Pashtu is the language of the Pashtun. It is also one of the two official languages of Afghanistan. Pashtu belongs to the North-Eastern group of languages within the Iranian branch of Indo-European family. Pashtun culture revolves around Islam and Pashtunwali, which is a set of social and cultural values and an ancient way of life, as well as speaking of the Pashtu language. It is also spoken by twelve million Pashtun populations living in Pakistan since its inception. Perso-Arabic script is used for the written version of Pashtu. Some archetypal examples of the Pashtu language include: *milmastia* (hospitality); *tureh* (courage, also the word for sword); *badal* (revenge); and *ghayrat* (protection of one's honor). A Pashtun tribal council is called *ajirga* (Monsutti, 2009).

As mentioned earlier that Pakistan is a multilingual and multicultural country where education is largely imparted in Urdu and English. English is also used as the official language of the state and as a medium of instruction in the universities where other languages, including Urdu and regional languages, are discouraged. Keeping in view the diverse cultural and linguistic background of the learners, the researcher aims to investigate the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer resulting in the incorporation of mother tongue linguistic and cultural norms into the target language (English, in this case). The interruption that mother tongue cultural resources may cause cannot simply be overlooked as they are likely to affect the pragmatic competence of the learners. Reliance on mother tongue could either be taken as a facilitating or a hindering factor during the learning process. This phenomenon may affect the production or comprehension of intended message in the target language, and this proposition is the primary investigation of this study. The realization and perception of speech acts differ across cultures as shown by the research literature as well as the intercultural experiences of individuals. Taking the cross culture setting of learners into consideration, the present study also investigates the phenomenon of sociopragmatic transfer in the production of speech acts in the target language, which is likely to differ among Pashtu and Saraiki English language learners. The study also highlights the discourse strategies of directness or indirectness (as the case may be) that the Saraiki and Pashtu English language learners possibly transfer from their mother tongue to English. The next section highlights the problem which created an urge within the researcher to conduct this study.

1.4 Statement of the Problem

Strategies employed for directness and indirectness in the accomplishment of speech acts vary across languages and cultures. English language learners from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds have been observed carrying out their discourses in English language by integrating linguistic and cultural resources from their mother tongue. In other words, the execution of communicative acts is carried out in the target language by relying on the linguistic and social norms of their mother tongue. This cross-cultural and cross-linguistic influence may create an ease for the learners in achieving an acceptable level of oral proficiency in the target language; however, it might hamper their ability to use the target language in a contextually appropriate manner. To study this phenomenon in greater depth, the present study

aims to investigate the direct and indirect discourse strategies that Pashtu and Saraiki learners of English language employ during the accomplishment of speech acts in the target language. Moreover, the study also highlights the deterrence posed by mother tongue in achieving a considerable level of pragmatic competence in the target language.

1.5 Research Objectives

The present study has the following objectives:

1. To investigate the occurrence of pragmatic transfer among Pashtu and Saraiki learners of English in their accomplishment of the speech acts of apology, refusal and request.
2. To explore the employment of the strategies of directness and indirectness during the realization of the selected speech acts by Pashtu and Saraiki learners of English.
3. To investigate the learners' inclination towards the use of pragmatic transfer as a resource during the accomplishment of the selected speech acts.
4. To explore the factors underlying pragmatic transfer that affect the pragmatic competence of the English language learners in the target language.

1.6 Research Questions

This study answers the following questions:

1. What specific in/direct discourse strategies do the selected Saraiki and Pashtu English language learners transfer from the mother tongue to the target language (English)?
2. Why do theselectedSaraiki and Pashtu English language learners use pragmatic transfer as a resource for accomplishing different communicative tasks in the target language?
3. How does pragmatic transfer affect the pragmatic competence of the selected English language learners in the target language?

1.7 Theoretical Framework

The present study is grounded in Kasper's (1992) notion of pragmatic transfer that demonstrates a prerequisite for learners to improve strategies for the production and understanding of the target language via mother tongue that facilitates L2 learning. Moreover, Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993) recognized five research areas comprising the notion of pragmatic transfer in the field of ILP. First, the focus of

pragmatic comprehension lies on the thorough considerations of the pragmatic conventions and norms to be followed during the accomplishment of different communicative tasks. Secondly, the production of linguistic actions which are executed through certain strategies developed during conversation, i.e., either direct or indirect strategies to accomplish a communicative act while transferring the influence of mother tongue into the target language. Thirdly, the area which focuses on the development of pragmatic competence clearly illustrates the ability of the speakers where learners from diverse linguistic backgrounds achieve certain level of pragmatic competence in the target language. The fourth area of ILP research is pragmatic transfer that demonstrates the transfer of pragmatic knowledge by learners from mother tongue to L2. In this regard, language users' performance of communicative acts in L2 and their interpretation is often attributed to pragmatic transfer. Thus, transfer resulting in IL, which is generally considered to be compatible with L2 (positive transfer) is the focus in pragmatics, yet as an underlying aspect of learners' pragmatic performance, it calls for further clarification. Therefore, the current study is aligned with the framework of pragmatic transfer that influences the learning of L2 due to mother tongue influence. However, the role of pragmatic transfer either creating an ease or difficulty for non-native speakers is the main focus of this study, which will look into the communicative outcomes of direct and indirect discourse strategies during L2 production.

Among these identified areas of research in ILP, the present study is specifically designed to explore the strategies transferred by the learners from their L1 to L2 during their production of L2, and to know the extent this transfer affects the pragmatic competence of English language learners. In this connection, Kasper (1992) has pointed out that non-native speakers vary in many respects from native speakers in the performance of several communicative acts. He further elaborates the use of several strategies by the learners where different linguistic forms are used to convey different illocutionary meanings. It has been concluded that non-native speakers are considerably predisposed to L2 learning through merging L1 pragmatic knowledge with L2 during the comprehension and production of a linguistic action in L2.

As said earlier, this study relies on the framework of pragmatic transfer, which focuses either on the integration of linguistic forms or social and cultural norms of the mother tongue in the target language. Moreover, sociopragmatic transfer further elaborates the intervention of cultural values in the target language. In this manner,

sociopragmatic transfer might create an ease or difficulty in learning the established norms of the target language. The strategies that are developed during the accomplishment of speech acts vary across cultures and languages, therefore, the present study falls in the domain of pragmatic transfer which encompasses two types of transfer known as pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatic transfer.

The present study also acknowledges the postulates lay down by Chen and Li (2016) who mainly focus on the transfer effects of mother tongue on the learning of L2 of Chinese English learners. The transfer of Chinese in English can be both positive and negative. They observed that the transfer of Chinese can also play a positive role in English writings. However, compared with negative transfer, the positive effect of Chinese is not so obvious. The study is also guided by the theoretical considerations on pragmatic transfer by Qu and Wang (2005) who have shown supportive findings in their research. The results reveal that the students with lower English proficiency make more pragmalinguistic transfer than the students with a relatively higher English proficiency. As the learners improve their English proficiency, they make negative pragmatic transfer but the pragmalinguistic errors are significantly reduced. Instead, they make more sociopragmatic transfer errors.

Furthermore, the present study is delimited to the phenomenon of sociopragmatic transfer that rests on the influence of mother tongue's cultural norms resulting in either communicative failure or shows the inability of the non-native speakers to perceive and utilize the established norms of the target language in a contextually appropriate manner. In short, the researcher found pragmatic transfer as an appropriate theoretical framework grounded in interlanguage pragmatics for exploring the outcomes of the accomplishment of the speech acts of apology, request and refusals in a cross-culture setting.

1.8 Mixed-Methods Research Paradigm

Before describing how and why the researcher placed this research in the mixed-methods tradition, it is essential here to discuss the importance of the two philosophies: Qualitative and Quantitative in relation with EFL/ESL classroom. Moreover, the selection of the appropriate methods is very significant and crucial in a research plan. However, Duff (2002) also indicates the problems related to the choice of the methods of research in the field of Applied Linguistics and asserts this fact in the following words:

The approach or method is crucially linked to the research question or problem under investigation, the purpose of the study (e.g., exploratory, interpretive, descriptive, explanatory, confirmatory, predictive) and the type of data and population one is working with (p. 14).

Quantitative research paradigm includes a variety of approaches, designs, and tools such as correlation, surveys, and multifactor studies, in addition to experimental or quasi-experimental studies. Qualitative research encompasses a broad, expanding assortment of approaches, including narrative research, life history, autobiographical or biographical accounts, content analysis, historical and archival studies, conversation analysis, micro ethnography, and discourse analysis. From the start of the study, it was in the mind of the researcher that the selection of appropriate and relevant research designs which helps to answer the research problems. For that purpose, the methods used in this study are in accordance with the research questions and resources at hand.

Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003b) found nearly 40 different classes of mixed methods designs. Creswell, Plano Clark, Gutmann, and Hanson (2003) have summarized the range of these classifications. Although they have emphasized different features and used different names, there are actually more similarities than differences among these classifications. The four major types of mixed method designs are the Triangulation Design, the Embedded Design, the Explanatory Design, and the Exploratory Design. The present study employs the triangulation design of mixed methods which is further embedded into the convergence model.

The most common and well-known approach to mixing methods is the Triangulation Design (Creswell, et al., 2003). The intent in using this design is to bring together the differing strengths and non-overlapping weaknesses of quantitative methods (large sample size, trends, generalization) with those of qualitative methods (small N, details, in depth) (Patton, 1990). This design and its underlying purpose of converging different method has been discussed extensively in the literature (e.g., Jick, 1979; Brewer & Hunter, 1989; Greene et al., 1989; Morse, 1991). This design is used when a researcher wants to directly compare and contrast quantitative statistical results with qualitative findings or to validate or expand quantitative results with qualitative data.

The Triangulation Design is a one-phase design which allows researchers to implement the quantitative and qualitative methods during the same timeframe and with equal weight. The single-phase timing of this design is the reason it has also been referred to as the “concurrent triangulation design” (Creswell, et al., 2003, p. 14). It generally involves the concurrent but separate collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data so that the researcher may best understand the research problem. The researcher attempts to merge the two data sets, typically by bringing the separate results together in the interpretation or by transforming data to facilitate integrating the two data types during the analysis. Jenkins’ (2001) single-phase study of rural adolescent perceptions of alcohol and other drug resistance is an example of a Triangulation Design. She collected and analyzed quantitative and qualitative data and merged the two data sets into one overall interpretation in which she related the quantitative results to the qualitative findings.

1.9 Data Analysis

The data collected from three different data collection tools is analyzed separately. Written DCTs comprising nine different situations were distributed among 30 participants. For the analysis of the speech act of apology, Cohen et al. (1986) suggest taxonomy of apologies, which illustrates different strategies of directness and indirectness that learners adopt during the accomplishment of the speech act of apology. The current study employs this taxonomy of apologies to analyze the speech act of apology. On the other hand, Blum-Kulka (1991) suggests an analytical framework for the analysis of the speech act of request that is further categorized into direct and indirect strategies. Some analytical postulates for the analysis of requests are also adopted from Beebe et al (1990).

For the analysis of the speech act of refusal, the sequence of refusal interactions conferring different roles of strategies as proposed by Felix-Brasdefer (2004) is used as an analytical framework. For the analysis of WDCTs and open role plays, descriptive statistics is employed for calculating the percentages which shows the occurrence of pragmatic transfer and content of strategies employed during the accomplishment of speech acts.

For the analysis of semi-structured interviews, thematic analysis is used for interpreting the collected data. Likewise, thematic analysis in qualitative research paradigm is a method used to analyze the informational matters of the documented

data (Mayring, 2000). In this study, thematic analysis is further supplemented with content analysis, which provides categories that are largely data driven and are based on qualitative analysis of data through numerous readings. In short, verbal data can be analyzed through the use of thematic analysis (Krippendorff, 2003; Weber, 1990).

1.10 Significance of the Study

The present study highlights the role of pragmatic transfer amongst Pashtu and Saraiki English Language learners. So far, research in the field of pragmatics has not been documented with Pakistani English language learners particularly in the area of interlanguage pragmatics. In this way, this study is an endeavor to introduce Pakistani languages into the domain of ILP. The study reveals and explores the cross-cultural and cross-linguistic transference of discourse strategies by the selected English language learners from their respective mother tongues to the target language (English), and therefore adds considerably to the field of pragmatic transfer, a phenomenon that is of utmost significance to interlanguage pragmatics.

In addition, the study aims at broadening the practical understanding of the learners' perceptions about sociopragmatic transfer, which affects the production abilities of the learners as it has been proven from research in the field of pragmatics that the accomplishment of speech acts differs among non-native speakers. As a contribution to the existing literature in the field of interlanguage pragmatics, this study will enlighten the researchers in the field of pragmatics. Furthermore, it also explores the factors that affect the pragmatic competence of the learners and aims at providing a remedy to encounter the pragmatic challenges during language learning process. It also serves to be a step forward in the field of pragmatics in general and specifically aims awareness among learners about the differences in terms of language use that exist in cross-cultural settings.

Most importantly, the present study sets out to bring to light that pragmatic transfer can be used as a resource in learning environments. Generally, the factors that affect the pragmatic competence of second language learners are highly influenced by such factors as social and cultural norms, student motivation and goals. The studies conducted in the past in the field of ILP have revealed the effective use of pragmatic transfer that allows learners to use mother tongue as a resource for their all-inclusive private and educational development. In fact, the present study hopes to open new

avenues of knowledge and potential with regard to the appropriate use of L1 knowledge in second language learning.

Furthermore, the present study is an effort at highlighting the cultural and social norms of the learners' mother tongue, the cultural identity of the English language learners which has been unnoticed in the teaching of English as a second language in Pakistan. The first language is language learners' basic asset which helps them in developing perceptions and thinking skills and, therefore, can be used as a tool in the learning of a second language. So, this study is a step forward in informing the second language learners about the significance of mother tongue that may create a convenience in the learning process of second language. At the same time, this study is, undoubtedly, a contribution in creating awareness about the pragmatic norms of the target language among the learners belonging to diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

1.11 Delimitations

This study delimits itself to the following:

- i) In the field of ILP, only the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer has been explored.
- ii) Pragmatic transfer is studied in the accomplishment of only three speech acts, viz. apology, request and refusal.
- iii) The phenomenon of pragmatic transfer is studied only among Pashtu and Saraiki learners of English.
- iv) Fifty undergraduate students are selected from a Pakistani university, viz. Gomal University, Dera Ismail Khan.

1.12 Organization of the Study

This thesis is divided into eight chapters.

Chapter 1. Introduction: This chapter provides a brief introduction to the study. It also provides a detailed background of the study focusing on the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer and how it emerged in the philosophy of language, and also provides introduction to cross-cultural and intercultural communication where speech acts are used.

Chapter 2. Literature Review: The chapter provides a brief discussion on the available literature in the field of pragmatics in general and interlanguage pragmatics in particular. It also discusses the other relevant notions, such as: interlanguage, direct

and indirect discourse strategies. A whole section has been dedicated to the discussion of pragmatic transfer, a research sub-area under interlanguage studies which is the focal point in the present study. The chapter concludes by reviewing early and recent studies on the three selected speech acts, viz. request, refusal and apology, and ends with a brief discussion on the gap identified in the already existing body of research.

Chapter 3. Research Methodology: This chapter focuses on the methodological standpoint of the study. The chapter discusses the tools used for collecting speech act data, interpretation of data through descriptive statistics, instruments, participants and procedure.

Chapter 4. Data Analysis I: This chapter is specified for the analysis of the data collected from the participants through written discourse completion tasks (WDCTs). The selected speech acts as executed by the participants have been discussed in detail. A detailed discussion has also been made on the results according to each situation to which responses are made in English. The chapter ends with a brief summary.

Chapter 5. Data Analysis II: This chapter presents the analysis of the data obtained from the second data collection tool, i.e., oral open role plays.

Chapter 6. Data Analysis III: In this chapter, the analysis of the interview sessions is presented. After transcription of the data, major themes have been identified in the form of codes and categories. This chapter ends with a summary of the findings from the interview data.

Chapter 7. Findings and Discussion: This chapter presents a brief summary of the findings obtained after the analysis of the data from the three data collection tools. After presenting the findings of the study, a discussion has been made to highlight the contribution of this study to the chosen field of research.

Chapter 8. Conclusion and Recommendations: This chapter concludes the study by providing answers to the research questions in the light of the findings of the study. The chapter also presents recommendations for the stakeholders of the study, i.e., the learners, the teachers and the researchers.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview of the chapter

This chapter provides a detailed overview of relevant literature with a particular focus on the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer. For the sake of clarity, the chapter is divided into three main sections. Section 1 discusses the emergence of pragmatic transfer and its development, and the sub-sections include a discussion on the phenomenon of transfer, its integration into language transfer and the corresponding types of pragmatic transfer. Section 2 discusses direct and indirect discourse strategies in detail. Section 3 provides a brief overview of the available researches on speech acts, emergence of interlanguage and studies in interlanguage pragmatics thereby leading to a gap in the specified area of research. Finally, the chapter ends with a brief summary.

2.1 Emergence of Pragmatic Transfer and its Development

Attempting to provide a sound definition of pragmatic transfer, the researchers so far have faced a number of difficulties. One is stating the scope of pragmatics itself; the other is the varying understandings of transfer. For example, pragmatic transfer is sociolinguistic transfer for Wolfson (1989) and cross-linguistic influence for Takahashi and Beebe (1993). To be specific, pragmatic transfer is defined as the influence wielded by learners' through already acquired pragmatic knowledge of languages and cultures in their conception, production and learning of L2 pragmatic information (Kasper 1992). It goes with Kasper and Blum-Kulka, (1993) who included the integration of L1 pragmatic features in L2 within the scope of pragmatic transfer. For Bou-Franch (2012), Kasper's definition is process-oriented and comprehensive in the sense that it allows the study of transfer in learning and communication. This is the reason that both Kasper (1992) and Ellis (1994) agreed to declare the term transfer as being synonymous to influence.

In consistence with the definition of pragmatic transfer as cited above, pragmatic knowledge is to be assumed as a specific constituent of language users' general ability of communicative knowledge, viz. knowledge of how verbal acts are comprehended and performed in accordance with a speaker's intention under specific contextual and discourse restrictions (Faerch & Kasper, 1984, as cited in Bou-Franch, 2012). Similarly, pragmatic transfer is about the presence of L1 or other languages'

norms in the use of TL. Pragmatic transfer is the main focus of the current study and will be discussed thoroughly in this section, which is meant to deal with research and methodological issues related to it. Before stating the emergence of pragmatic transfer, it is necessary to look at the term transfer from a historical perspective, and to know how it comes to collocate with the word pragmatics.

Starting with a historical perspective helps to understand how certain research traditions in the area of pragmatic transfer have been adapted from research on general language transfer. Transfer studies are dated back to the 1940's and the 1950's. The term transfer was introduced during the contrastive era (i.e., Contrastive Analysis, henceforth CA) that was dominated at that time by behaviorism and structural linguistics (Fries, 1945; Lado, 1957). In the 1960's, the noticeable influence of L1 on L2 especially at the phonological level led to formulating the so-called Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (henceforth, CAH), which suggested that L1 is likely to influence L2 both negatively and positively. It was, at that time, a fashion to believe that features which are similar in L1 and L2 are likely to be transferred positively to L2, and conversely those which are different in L1 and L2 are likely to be transferred negatively to L2. The former type of transfer is positive that facilitates the learning of those features already acquired, which creates an ease in the learning process of L2. The latter is negative which is labeled as interference and, thus, leads to an erroneous use of these features, and hampers the ability of learners in achieving an independent pragmatic competence in L2. Studying the emergence of pragmatic transfer further leads to recent studies on the notion of transfer, which was integrated into language transfer later on.

2.1.1 Transfer and its Integration into Language Transfer

Before presenting some detailed literature on the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer, it is essential to present some discussion on the origin of transfer in relevance to language transfer studies. During the mid-decades of 20th century around 50s and 60s, language transfer studies got much popularity under the guidance of behaviorism and structuralism. Language transfer can be defined as a psychological phenomenon that originated from behaviorist psychology which illustrates that learning new knowledge or language is predominantly influenced by a priori knowledge or skill of first language. Elaborating the notion of transfer, Lado (1957) put forward the term language transfer under the impact of behaviorism which indicated that learners incorporate the linguistic and cultural resources of their native language into target

language in acquiring both productive and receptive skills. In other words, transfer to pragmatics indicates the notion of mother tongue interference in the use of the target language. Moreover, this landmark phenomenon of transfer was a step to probe into cultural similarities and differences between languages, and the major focus was maintained on the accomplishment of different speech acts in those languages.

For the term language transfer, James (1980) identified that first language affects second language learning. Likewise, Faerch and Kasper (1987) claimed that language transfer is a psychological practice for the language learners who incorporate linguistic resources of their mother tongue into the target language. Since then, studies on transfer among languages have turned into communal practice in second/foreign language research. Following this notion, Odlin (1989) who elaborated the concept of linguistic transfer which is defined as an outcome of similarities and differences among languages rests on the influence of the mother tongue while learning the target language. This L1 influence on L2 is also known as substratum transfer (Odlin, 1989). Initially, the term 'transfer' was viewed as either positive or negative. By then, it was alleged that negative transfer is the outcome of an interference of mother tongue's linguistic and social norms which create either a difficulty or an ease for learners during the learning process of target language. This idea paved ground for the formation of Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (Lado, 1957) whose main focus rested on the structural differences among languages that cause difficulty and indicate interloping errors in L2. Nevertheless, research has shown that even correspondence between languages can be challenging and often differences seem to assist SLA as acknowledged by Catford (1964). At that time, transfer was not taken as a factor that created a problem in the process of SLA.

Nonetheless, during the developmental stage of transfer, second language acquisition was viewed (Dulay & Burt, 1975) as an ingenious production process wherein old habits of L1 got transferred into L2. Similarly, developmental errors were observed to occur as a consequence of learners' strategies being adopted during language learning process to make the process easier (Taylor, 1975). This notion was harshly criticized because it took into consideration a limited role of transfer in the acquisition process of L2 (Smith, 1996). Following this idea, Danesi (1995) demonstrated that both transfer and creative communicative aspects could not simply be overlooked as these were the emerging issues in learning a second or foreign language. Among procedures precarious to the learning of a second language,

language transfer is regarded as a critical process. Other procedures and patterns identified are: overgeneralization, transfer-of-training, L2 learning strategies and L2 communication strategies (Selinker, 1972). Keeping this in view, Sridhar (1980) illustrates that linguistic transfer is a prominent variable in L2 learning but, at the same time, warns the researchers to shift attention from the behaviorist perspective of transfer to the transfer of how different strategies of L1 are administered in L2.

Language transfer plays a significant role in second language learning; however, true realization of this phenomenon has not been acknowledged yet as a mandatory mechanism in L2 acquisition. The significance of transfer, on the other hand, has not been entirely cherished in SLA research, pedagogy and classroom contexts. Transfer from mother tongue was, in behaviorist perspective, taken as a kind of influence or incorporation of L1 practices in the process of L2 learning. Fries (1945), one of the leading behaviorists, asserted that the interference of mother tongue creates an obstacle for the learners of a second language. In contrast to this, Lado (1957) emphasized the importance of mother tongue, considering it as a useful device that created an ease in L2 learning. It was he who articulated Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis focusing mainly on the intersection of native language into target language. Conferring to this hypothesis, both the productive and receptive abilities are guided by the knowledge of L1 in learning second language, thus, L1 is also used as a marker that creates an ease in the learning process of L2.

Subsequent to this viewpoint, several SLA researchers such as Krashen and Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982) further claimed that L2 is acquired in the same way as L1 is acquired and L2 learner errors are analogous to L1 learner errors; they are predominantly developmental, and in turn do not result in the form of errors which can be called 'transfer'. This standpoint, however, modulated suggestively the role and purposes of L1 transfer and therefore deliberated it as an irrelevant factor in SLA scheme and teaching. Notwithstanding, the harsh disapprovals to the functions of L1 transfer in the early 1970s and 1980s, the theory based on language transfer has realized a remedial measure during the current years with some researchers who located the domain of language transfer within a cognitive perspective of language learning.

Additionally, Gass (2000) argues that a cognitive approach seeks an answer to the interpretation of transfer as practices, and pays much consideration to the learner to decide as to what should or should not be transported to L2 learning. In contrast to

this, Selinker (1983) proposed a mentalistic interpretation about the significant role of L1 in L2 learning while taking transfer into consideration as the foremost cognitive process in L2 acquisition. He introduced the term 'interlanguage' which refers to the L2 learners' language, which has been identified as an operating system between the learners' L1 and L2. In his words, L1 transfer plays a vital role to strengthen the development of interlanguage. Later, Odlin (1989) regarded transfer as a cross-linguistic practice resulting from the influence of L1 and other languages that the learner may have already acquired. According to Odlin (1989), negative transfer may happen when the L1 linguistic and social norms are embedded in L2 production, in case there is a violation of the target language norms.

During the recent years, scholars have also inferred as well as endorsed the evidence of L1 transfer which is not only a compound mental operation but also includes a range of strategies L2 learners utilize during the acquisition process of L2 (as suggested by Cohen & Brooks-Carson, 2001; Mahmoud, 2000, 2005; Mu & Carrington, 2007; Wolfersberger, 2003). In this connection, Schachter (1983) argued that transfer itself is a strategy for the learner while ensuring a productive role in the entire process. Furthermore, Bialystok (1993) demonstrates that learner's reliance on the use of mother tongue indicates the strategies used to tackle both learning and gaining communicative competence. Following this view, the differences and correspondences between L1 and L2 along with other factors such as learner prospects, goals, attitudes, learning mechanisms and inclinations have all been identified as the elements affecting L1 transfer in a second language learning process. In this connection, Faerch and Kasper (1987) assumed transfer as a perceptual and a communicative practice in which L2 learners easily improve their interlanguage skills by incorporating the already existing linguistic understanding. These researchers formulated three types of transfer, viz. strategic transfer whereby the learner dispenses pivotal consideration to a communicative problem and its elucidation; subsidiary transfer arises when there is no focal attentiveness of the emerging issue or indulgence of transmitted L1 knowledge; and automatic transfer occurs when the learner uses L1 in a highly controlled manner with consideration completely preoccupied to other phases in the production procedure.

To sum up the above discussion, it is contended that the theory of language transfer went through three different developmental stages. In the 1950s, linguistic theories were much under the influence of behaviorism. The function of transfer was

fully recognized and assimilated with behaviorism, thus it became the theoretical basis of comparative analysis. At the outset of 1960s to the end of 1970s, it was highly influenced by Chomsky's language theory, and behaviorism was severely criticized. The third stage comprises of the period from the beginning of the 1980s till now. At this stage, the phenomenon of language transfer became increasingly popular. The word "transfer" does not merely refer to the automatic transfer from a native language to a foreign language. It was preserved as a kind of vital learning strategy in language acquisition, and a complicated cognitive procedure that is influenced by various factors. There is a popular classification of the effects of language transfer, viz. positive transfer and negative transfer. It becomes imperative to understand the difference between two types of transfer, which is discussed in the next sub-section.

2.1.2 Pragmatic Transfer in Relevance to Language Transfer

Interlanguage pragmatics emerged on the SL research scene when the idea that transfer was incompatible with a cognitive view of SLA had already been filed as of historic interest. Therefore, it was acknowledged that transfer is a major factor in determining non-native speakers' (henceforth, NNS) pragmatic knowledge. Research based on transfer in interlanguage pragmatics primarily focuses on the identification of transfer, shaping situations for transfer to happen, and its interaction with, in Odlin's (1989) terms, other structural and non-structural factors involved in the occurrence of transfer. The area which has received consistently more attention in the study of pragmatic transfer is the study of communicative effects than any other area of cross-linguistic influence, with an exception of sociolinguistic concerns for phonological transfer. This is not a surprising notion because in the real world, pragmatic transfer matters more, or at least are more apparent, than transfer of relative clause structure or word order. Before taking a closer look at the research on these issues, some theoretical and terminological explanation is in order.

Moreover, the term pragmatic transfer has been defined in numerous ways, Odlin (1989), for instance, acknowledges that transfer occurs due to the influence of mother tongue in the form of similarities and differences between the target language and any other language that has been earlier (and perhaps imperfectly) acquired. Defining the term pragmatic transfer which is controversial because of the incongruity of how to explain the scope of pragmatics, Wolfson (1989) states:

"The use of the rules of speaking from one's own native speech community, when interacting with members of the host community or

simply when speaking or writing in a second language is known as sociolinguistic or pragmatic transfer” (p. 141).

She further maintained that the adjectives 'pragmatic' and 'sociolinguistic' are used interchangeably (p. 15), and so are 'sociolinguistic rules' and 'rules of speaking', referring to 'the patterns and conventions of language behavior' (p. 14). This impression of pragmatic transfer is drawn from Leech's (1983) classification of pragmatic transfer into pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatic transfer. This classification is extended further by Thomas (1983) in order to differentiate between two major types of 'pragmatic failure'; the same distinction is similarly appropriate to separate the two main types of pragmatic transfer. Following Leech's distinction, the term pragmalinguistics transfer refers to the specific linguistic resources of L1 used for conveying particular illocutions in L2 (Leech, 1983). To put it differently, since in the performance of a specific linguistic or communicative act, interlocutors select from different sources of accessible strategies and communicative contents which have the potential of conveying a particular illocution. Therefore, strategies of directness and indirectness, and an excess of lexical, syntactic, and prosodic means must be capable of strengthening the illocutionary force. Such strategies are identified cross-linguistically as politeness designs (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper, 1989).

According to Beebe, Takahashi and Wetzl (1990), the term pragmatic transfer refers to sociocultural competence of L1 prompts in terms of transfer when speaking or writing in L2. Extending the notion beyond it, Takahashi and Beebe (1990) acknowledge that 'cross-linguistic influence' and 'transfer' can be used interchangeably. In the same vein, Odlin (1989) selects 'discourse transfer' over 'pragmatic transfer', noticing correspondence and development in the range of the twofold areas. In this connection, Clyne, Ball and Neil (1991) demarcate intercultural, contrastive, and interlanguage pragmatics from intercultural, contrastive, and interlanguage discourse, and thus transfer can be consequently organized. Likewise, Scarcella (1983) identifies the transference of the features embedded into forms and functions of L2 by observing the strategies during conversational management, as 'discourse accent' (p. 306). She has, therefore, an apprehension with discourse and one of its subgenres or corresponding types known as conversation. The term 'transfer' as a constituent in 'pragmatic transfer' requires some explanation because 'transfer' in terms of integrating linguistic resources from NL into interlanguage (henceforth IL)

refers to other categories of interlingual influence. In other words, Kellerman and Smith (1986) suggested that the notion of transfer might not be kept limited to certain instances or cases, and proposed other types of L1 effects, for instance, avoidance of native language use, L1 restrictions on L2 acquisition process and presentation, multiplicity of interlingual effects is known as 'cross-linguistic influence' (henceforth, CLI).

In short, research conducted in the past shows an influence of L1 acquired knowledge, societal norms, ethics and insights on learners' L2 pragmatic knowledge and performance; a need was felt to develop such a term that contentedly encompassed both the linguistic and non-linguistic characteristics. Therefore, the emergence of pragmatic transfer in ILP primarily referred to the influence that motivated learners' previous knowledge of languages and cultures when producing, comprehending and learning L2. In other words, interlanguage pragmatics refers to the development of unstable, deficient and permeable pragmatic knowledge of L2 learners. In addition, Blum-Kulka and Sheffer (1993) extended the notion to the reasonably stable varieties observed among hybrid speech communities that perform fascinating communication practices as a result of diglossia or heteroglossia and cultural contact. The concept of interlanguage as evolved is more reminiscent of Reinecke's (1969) sociolinguistic approach than of Selinker's (1972) psycholinguistic view. The present study focuses on the investigation of the sociopragmatic transfer conventions which are the use of cultural norms of mother tongue are used by L2 learners when speaking or writing in L2. In the present study, a focus is also made on the strategies of being direct or indirect during the production of discourse in the target language by Pashtu and Saraiki learners of English language. Therefore, it is essential here to discuss the two sub-types of pragmatic transfer known as 'pragmalinguistics', and 'sociopragmatic transfer' after presenting a detailed discussion on the relevance of language transfer to pragmatic transfer.

2.1.3 Pragmalinguistic vs. Sociopragmatic Transfer

The distinction is often attributed to Kasper (1992) who first attempted to draw a classification of negative pragmatic transfer and documented that the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer reflects itself in two types, known as pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatic. Consequently, it can be concluded from Kasper's dichotomous division of pragmatic transfer with further two corresponding

types of negative transfer. These types are known as negative pragmalinguistics transfer and negative sociopragmatic transfer. Kasper's dichotomous handling of pragmatic transfer, positive and negative, appears to have been corresponding to other concerns such as pragmatic transfer that is placed under the category of pragmalinguistics and focuses on the transfer of internal linguistic forms; likewise, an insertion of sociopragmatic transfer deliberates upon an attention to the social or communicative features. This appears a thorough and fair treatment of the subject matter, and that is the reason her classification of pragmatic transfer either positive or negative, has never been challenged since 1992 and in fact, her classification has been engaged as a framework in the studies on pragmatic transfer.

Pragmatics evolved in one of the current fields of socio-psycho-linguistics investigated by second language researchers, but the studies with an overt focus on pragmatics appeared no later than the 1970s (Johnston & Hackmann, 1977; Kasper, 1979a). Since, pragmatics was not considered seriously in the beginning, early SLA debate revolves around contrastive hypothesis and creative construction (henceforth, CC). Upon the scope and definition of the term, Levinson (1983) demonstrated that pragmatics is primarily and essentially concerned with 'utterance meaning', or in the words of Leech (1983), contextualized language usages. The principal concern is to know how learners obtain L2 pragmatic knowledge instead of looking at the way how non-native language users recognize, understand, and articulate speech and writing in the target language.

Many scholars investigating interlanguage pragmatics have extracted their theoretical reinforcements from empirical pragmatics. Among these studies of different NS speech or discourse communities, data-based issues have been addressed to explore whether NNS vary from NS in terms of choice, contextual dissemination, strategies followed, linguistic forms used to convey a particular illocutionary meaning and politeness (Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper, 1989). Moreover, research on speech act has already been stimulated by psycholinguistics with a focus on making an understanding of literal and non-literal meaning (Beebe, Takahashi & Uliss-Weltz, 1990). To sum up, interlanguage pragmatics has predominantly been inclined to a greater interest in investigating the sociolinguistic issues, and focuses less on the psycholinguistic study of NNS' linguistic accomplishment. Referring back to Leech's (1983) concept of pragmalinguistics, Thomas (1983) defined the term pragmalinguistics transfer as:

the inappropriate transfer of speech act strategies from one language to another, or the transferring from the mother tongue to the target language of utterances which are semantically /syntactically equivalent, but which, because of different 'interpretive bias', tend to convey a different pragmatic force in the target language (1983, p. 101).

Upon the definition of the term, sociopragmatics is defined by Leech as 'the sociological boundary of pragmatics' (1983, p. 10) mentioning to the social insights encompassing participants' presentation and understanding of linguistic action. The assessment of learners' performance considering the social distance and social power, rights and obligations, and extent of imposition tangled in different linguistic acts vary cross-culturally (Takahashi & Beebe, 1989; Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper, 1989; Bergman & Kasper, 1993; Olshtain, 1989). A difference has been marked between context-external factors elucidating participants' role relationship independent of a specific linguistic action and context internal factors, which are intrinsic to the current speech event (Brown & Fraser, 1979; Blum-Kulka & House, 1989). As pointed out by interactional sociolinguists (Gumperz, 1982; Erickson & Shultz, 1982), who have apprehended the notion in Fraser's (1990) 'conversational contract', both factors are profound enough for modification through the subtleties of conversational interaction. Since then, the differential contextual assessments differ from each other as derived from the boundary between macro and micro-levels of social organization; they are also contemplative of predominant personal and interpersonal directions, such as commencements of self (Markus & Kitayama, 1991), and preferences for types of politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Scollon, 2000; Olshtain & Cohen, 1989). In contrast to this, sociopragmatic transfer occurs when the social insights underlying language users' understanding and production of linguistic action in the target language are predisposed by their assessment of intuitively comparable native language contexts. As Olshtain and Cohen (1989) forwarded that speakers may transfer their insights of social norms from native language situations to second language situations. Such a transfer could affect the quality of a particular speech act.

This difference between pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatic transfer is rationally convenient and, as Thomas (1983) has commented with reference to pragmatic failure, is pedagogically significant; the two standpoints are obviously interwoven into each other. In addition, Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness

model, for example, announcements about the judgment of how much politeness is supposed to be invested in the accomplishment of a face threatening act is based on the assessment of applicable contextual factors that fall in the domain of sociopragmatics. Interestingly, the selection and then execution of a specific politeness strategy and the specific means of language for its implementation are placed in the domain of pragmalinguistics. The distinction becomes indefinite in the case of indirectness, where an illocution is allocated one meaning by means of another one. To decide whether a speech act is meant for apology or not, for instance, is a sociopragmatic one; likewise, the decision whether or not to offer an interpretation or explanation for the committed offense, an act which functions for making an apology, thus comprises a pragmalinguistics choice. It happens when language users' communicative ability and interpretation becomes subject to pragmatic transfer, that is, it most frequently diverges from the target language norms (explicitly or implicitly given the prominence of a pragmatic norm).

The credit goes to Kasper (1992) who claimed that pragmatic transfer manifests itself via two means, namely pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatic. Pragmalinguistics, in the words of Leech (1983) pinpoints the already acquired linguistic knowledge; on the other hand, sociopragmatics focuses on how our sociological knowledge exerts an influence during our interaction. Similarly, sociopragmatic transfer takes into consideration the pragmatic transfer of social or communicative features. Hence, this classification of Kasper (1992) has been employed as a framework in the studies of pragmatic transfer. Likewise, pragmalinguistics transfer refers closely to the stimulus of the learner's knowledge applied in the illocutionary force or politeness value which signifies the particular linguistic form-function in native language (henceforth, NL). It will become clear if a discussion is made on the two types of negative pragmatic transfer.

2.1.4 Negative Pragmalinguistic Transfer vs. Negative Sociopragmatic Transfer

Many scholars have documented a host of studies regarding negative pragmalinguistics transfer, for instance, Crystal and House (1988) documented the frequent usage of the expression "excuse me", which was observed among the German learners, indicating an influence of high rate of German language. However, the Japanese language influence was observed to be subject to situation in the frequency of "excuse me". In terms of time, place and parties, the Japanese learners

were using fewer persuasive strategies than the Americans, while in making refusals; the Japanese were more prone to the use of pleadings (Beebe et al, 1990). During the investigation of the phenomenon of negative sociopragmatic transfer which was evident to be in operation in Venezuelan politeness styles among Spanish learners of English (Garcia, 1989) while Japanese considered status difference in the production of refusals as found in the study by Beebe et al. (1990). In addition, Takahashi and Beebe (1993) found that Japanese were more prone to the use of explanation as a strategy in politeness orientation and transforming rectifications by means of positive interpretations and softeners. In addition, numerous forms of NL-TL communicative style patterns were identified. Scarcella (1983) asserted that learners transfer their Spanish (NL) and German (NL) accustomed communicative styles into English. These communicative styles and patterns neither fall into pragmalinguistic nor sociopragmatic transfers. So, the findings of these studies also suggest that both types of negative transfer affect the entire strategy duly followed in accomplishing different speech acts in L2.

Studies on sociopragmatic transfer have been established to stimulate learners' views on contextual factors, such as considering whether the execution of a particular linguistic action is appropriate in the given context or not, and of the complete politeness style implemented during the accomplishment of speech acts or the acts they encounter. Likewise, Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz (1990) demonstrated in their studies on Japanese learners of English who vary in their choice of refusal strategies along the identical contextual constraint as native speakers of Japanese, viz. taking into consideration whether the status of a refuser is higher or lower than the interlocutor. For example, in the context of restating an interlocutor's statement, Takahashi and Beebe (1993) presented several evidences for a diverse NL-influenced pattern observed in style-shifting of Japanese learners' English, depending on the speaker's higher or lower status on the account of the hearer.

Likewise, it reproduces the idea that social appropriateness of a communicative act in the learners' native culture affects proficiency thereby accomplishing the same linguistic action in the target language in a given context. As an instance, refusals in English by female Japanese learners of English are strongly discouraged in Japanese society. Thus, these studies reveal the significance of mother tongue in the learning process of target language, that it creates an ease for the learners of second language. So, the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer is viewed as a

facilitating resource during the accomplishment of different communicative tasks in the target language. In addition, it facilitates the learners with achieving a proficiency in L2 via the influence of mother tongue. Therefore, it becomes essential here to discuss the two broad outcomes of pragmatic transfer that occur in the form of positive and negative transfer as a result of mother tongue's influence in the learning process of L2.

2.1.5 Positive Transfer

Keeping the notion of transfer into consideration, it can be inferred that positive transfer has shown positive effects on learning in terms of similarities in two languages. On the other hand, negative transfer follows when two languages fall apart and have some great differences. Thus, the former proves helpful in creating an ease in learning, while the negative transfer hampers the competence in learning. For instance, English and French both belong to Indo-European language family, so it is much easier for English native speakers to learn French. In this connection, Liu and Wen (2006) stated that although Chinese and English belong to two different language families, the Chinese as mother tongue also plays its positive role in English learning. Such as in phonetics, Cha (2007) demonstrated that it is easy for Chinese learners to pronounce consonant sounds like /b/, /p/, /t/, /d/, /k/, /g/ and others.

Likewise, the influence of NL results in positive outcomes of the target language, which is embodied by the theory of Common Underlying Proficiency (henceforth, CUP). To elaborate it further, Cummins (1983) put forward a “dual-iceberg” analogy to designate the transfer from the mother tongue into second language among bilingual learners' mother tongue to the second language. As the twofold iceberg itself suggests, NL and TL are detached proficiencies, but as an outcome, they overlap and reciprocally share convinced abstract universal underlying principles and limitations, which are common and subject to all-natural languages. On these grounds, it clearly pertains that learners display their language proficiency through the usage of two different modes. In the compliance of skills, knowledge and concepts developed in native language can be easily transferable in acquiring the TL. To sum up, the CUP model manifests for an essential cognitive proficiency that is shared in common across languages.

To argue further, Cummins (1983) asserted that three literacy-related components are common across the domain of languages following the model of the CUP. The foremost element of CUP is obviously conceptual knowledge. By the same

demonstration, the knowledge about subject matter, thinking skills, reading strategies, writing composition skills and so on, is made possible in learning through the channel of NL transfer or becomes accessible to L2 by giving adequate acquaintance and motivation. The second most important element in the CUP is common experience. In this regard, Francis (2000) put forward a third component that occurs in the CUP which includes actual linguistic knowledge. These transfers range from comprehension competencies, discourse competencies, formal representations, and organizational skills. Carson (1990) further enhanced the CUP by recommending the beginning level as an indispensable condition for positive L1 transfer to occupy a place in the following summary: a) the existence of a common primary proficiency with an onset level of language proficiency that permits skills meant to be transferred. b) There exists an underlying proficiency along with a level of language proficiency and cognitive rearrangement that sanctions skills to transfer. c) A separate language system exists with cognitive separation of language skills. Transfer takes place in learning TL at the stage wherein two previously separated but structurally alike languages come into contact with each other. To elaborate, there must be a device by which we can explore similarities between languages or streamline our experience to seek new interpretations of TL input, and there is need for a mechanism that sustains strategies and information meant to be shared across languages on account of cognitive proficiency.

Research in the past has revealed the positive NL transfer to TL transfer and denies the outcomes of negative NL influences on the learning of TL. These studies found positive NL transfer in different phases including the transfer of reading and writing skills, strategies and perceptions. Further, it revealed that positive transfer ordinarily rests on the cognitive levels. For instance, Upton and Lee-Thompson (2001) investigated an integration of mother tongue in TL reading process of Chinese and Japanese ESL learners. This study has answered the question of whether TL readers use their NL cognitive properties and if it facilitates comprehension in the TL text. This study yielded several important findings. First, it was asserted that reading in TL was not based on the assumption of monolingual event. The readers were more likely to read the text of TL with frequent access to the underlying resources of NL which was used as a strategy to comprehend the text of TL. Secondly, low proficiency group was using the resources of NL when encountered with unfamiliar L2 vocabulary wherein the high proficiency group showed less reliance on the resources

of NL. In other words, the readers with low ability had a greater inclination to operate the mechanism of the reading of TL text and sentence meaning by incorporating linguistic elements of their first language. On the other hand, the high proficiency participants were tended to use TL which was primarily considered as the language of thought and speech. Lastly, the low proficiency learners were inclined to filter the sentences of TL they understood directly by interpreting and approving their understanding in the NL, a strategy not engaged by the higher achievers in the study.

Similarly, the significant focus of positive L1 transfer falls in the strategies of transfer. In this vein, some studies have lent supporting evidence. For example, Hall (1990) inspected revision strategies in the NL and TL writing tasks. Among them, four advanced ESL subjects wrote two different argumentative essays in their native languages and two in English, belonging to different NL background. The findings of the study exposed some remarkable similarities between NL and TL reviews with regard to both the linguistic and discourse structures for the identified changes in order to reach the stages when the changes were initiated. He concluded that the advanced ESL writers were proficient of employing a sole system of revision across languages, and this system was primarily molded in their first language and successively transferred to the second language. Below, negative transfer, which happens as an outcome of the occurrences of pragmatic transfer, has been discussed.

2.1.6 Negative Transfer

To put it in simple words, negative transfer is also known as interference of the first language. Moreover, it focuses on the use of native language rules which result in errors during production in the target language. According to the behaviorists' version, negative transfer might cause damage, hinder and suspend the acquisition process of second language. For instance, Deng (2006) demonstrated that Chinese and English belong to diverse language systems, but the differences between them influence the acquisition of English. For Chinese students they have formed the mode of thinking in their mother tongue, the rules of their native language will influence or impose on the acquisition of new knowledge. A case for this point is that there exists one kind of language—Chinglish in China. Chinglish refers to spoken or written English language with a strong flavor of Chinese. It can be proved that Chinglish is caused by the incomplete knowledge of the rules of target language. Especially at lexical level, Chinese learners assume that the meaning of English words is equivalent to Chinese words. Hence, negative transfer can occur at all levels of

language structure; for example, at the phonetic level, in which a speaker clearly reflects on his/her foreign accent occurs in the process of foreign language learning. This view of non-transfer of NL into TL is characterized by the theory of Creative Construction (henceforth, CC). In this connection, Faerch and Kasper (1987) contended that TL is acquired along with NL in a parallel way as a product of the same innate mental appliances that TL learners universally employ, and the process of learning is not affected by incorporating linguistic resources through NL transfer into TL.

In the same vein, Dulay & Burt (1972) rely on the acquisition of TL, enabled by UG principles, where NL has no role; rather the learner uninterruptedly enunciates hypotheses about the TL system and contests them against the existing ideas. Thus, Ellis (1994) demonstrated that learners from different NL backgrounds follow almost a mutual path of achieving proficiency in the TL. As mentioned earlier that negative transfer can be found at all levels of language structure, for example, a case for that can be found at the phonetic level at which a speaker's foreign accent is embedded in the process of foreign language learning. Similarly, Liu and Wen (2006) asserted that Chinese learners are restricted by geographical dialect. In addition, Chinese learners often make mistakes in the collocation of words. For instance, maybe some students tend to say "look TV" rather than "watch TV". And the negative transfer exists at syntactical level, textual level and cultural level as well. The apparent reason behind this phenomenon could be that some words in English are hard to find the corresponding and equivalent words in Chinese. The contrastive analysis is a more effective way to prevent the negative transfer of mother tongue.

In quintessence, this hypothesis has postulated two theoretical perspectives closely related to NL transfer, i.e., the uninterrupted of NL and learning of TL in a similar way of acquiring NL. The first part of this statement ignores the role of NL and accentuates the influence of universal procedures for language learning and the similarity between TL and NL acquisition. Following this hypothesis, NL has a less significant role in the learning of TL. The L2 = L1 hypothesis validates whether there are essential principles that underlie common notions between L1 and L2, and to investigate whether the language acquisition method which according to mentalists' view, is held responsible for L1 acquisition is available to L2 learners. The similarity may be marked and distinguished at the level of product. Thus, communicative

competence (henceforth, CC) encompasses the role of L1 and emphasizes the influence of universal processes of language acquisition.

Many studies have been conducted pertaining to the results of negative transfer from numerous aspects of language, like phonological, syntactic, and discourse levels. Taking the example of the phonological level, Rintell (1984) asserted that negative transfer occurred among Chinese English learners in articulating certain sounds in which similarity at phonetic level was found resembling the phonetic features of their NL. It was evident that Chinese speakers had faced difficulty in identifying the emotional states of native speakers of English because Chinese speakers' perceived and arbitrated the language English which followed the tone of Chinese language. All this transference of phonological knowledge consequently stemmed into errors. At syntactic level, Li (2004) found that negative transfer of syntax was also found among the learners of TL. He observed the effect of the transfer of NL in the learning of English reflexive pronouns with locus to Chinese learners of English. Apart from this, the study also investigates how Chinese learners of ESL utilized knowledge of the underlying linguistic resources of Chinese reflexive "self", himself/herself as a core framework for the learning of English ones. The findings revealed that negative NL transfer takes place in the entire acquisition process of English reflexives.

In contrast to these studies, Li (2004) discussed at length the strategies adopted during the learning process of TL which resulted due to the transfer of NL. In the same study, it has been revealed through experiments by associating the high and low proficiency English learners in their practice of word-guessing strategies in the reading skills of NL and TL. This study traces out two types of transfer among Chinese EFL learners. In the first category, a general kind of transfer was evident in which high and low learners had adopted related strategy in accomplishing various reading tasks in both NL and TL. These strategies were executed in the form of inferential capabilities and problem-solving aptitudes. Second, a different strategy was found among high and low proficient learners. The high proficiency learners employed different strategy patterns during the performance of different tasks while the low proficiency learners did so with their inadequate and static patterns. To sum up the above discussion, upon the interference of NL, Upton (2001) pointed out that learners with low proficiency while learning TL are bound to turn on their NL linguistic resources to develop the world-view into TL. These NL resources are used

by the learners to bridge the relation with word- and sentence-level problems, confirm knowledge, and foresee text structure, content and reading behavior. Thus, studies like this one mutually agree upon that learners are quite judicious in the use of NL, which quite naturally serves as a tool to help learners develop their second language in every aspect.

In a different study, Carson et al (1990) investigated through an empirical survey and contrasted the writing and reading abilities of the first language and second language adult ESL learners to identify the relationships across languages (NL and TL) and across productive and receptive skills (reading and writing) in the acquisition of TL literacy skills. In a recent study on bilingual transfer, Francis (2000) argued that it is mandatory to postulate more precisely the domains of language competence and language in use which are interdependent. In a research on Chinese EFL learners' TL writing patterns, Cao (1989) empirical evidence on how Chinese EFL learners constitute their comparison-contrast essays. She revealed that the Chinese learners of English do not transfer their NL speech making patterns in their TL writing. To be brief here, it seems that there is no logically obligatory connection between literacy skills in one language and efficacious acquisition of another language correspondingly. Studies have revealed that several indicators are involved that allow the learner to use pragmatic transfer as a strategy in the learning process of L2. In short, language transfer is inevitable in second language acquisition. After having discussed the function and role of language transfer in English, it can be inferred that both positive and negative transfer are important equally. Therefore, an overview of the factors that are involved in the occurrence of pragmatic transfer is presented in the section below.

2.1.7 Indicators of Pragmatic Transfer

There are different indicators of pragmatic transfer in the existing literature, which suggest the influence of one language upon another. However, the influence of mother tongue which results in the form of pragmatic transfer has been discussed much in empirical research and the researcher will explain a series of such cases of pragmatic transfer, which is the goal of this section. Moreover, among them numerous studies focus on the negative manifestation of negative transfer because it is closely related to the presentation of self, to the image of oneself that others perceive during communication. In this regard, Wolfson (1981) demonstrated that non-native speakers have difficulties in identifying and interpreting appropriately the real-life

communicative tasks in the target language. For example, Gregori and Bou (1998) asserted in their study that learners' tendency to frequently backchannel in Spanish recommended the influence of L1 on the L2 production of backchannels.

The above-mentioned studies show the presence of the phenomenon of transfer at the pragmatic level; at the same time, some studies remain unsuccessful in identifying the existence of transfer. According to Takahashi (2010), this is one of the prominent reasons that pragmatic transfer occurs in a highly context-dependent situation. It demonstrates further that there are some specific factors that influence the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer. Those factors can be either context-external (like the interlocutors' familiarity and their status) or context-internal (like the degree of imposition in request and the obligation to apologize). Moreover, the state of affairs that leads a learner to rely on L1 linguistic and cultural resources might also intermingle with pragmatic transfer. Thus, research in pragmatic transfer focuses less on the occurrence of positive transfer as it is very difficult to assert that the learners really depend on their L1, since they might be using their pragmatic knowledge, instead of resorting to their L1, or make use of other learnt forms (Kasper, 1992; Takahashi, 2010).

In this regard, Bou-Franch (1998) introduces the term 'transferability constraints' which indicates certain conditions that might avoid or inspire transfer. This endeavor is made to identify those conditions that necessitate, according to her, the use of process-oriented approach that targets at answering these two questions: 1) what is transferred, and 2) under what circumstances, transfer does take place? For this purpose, further studies are required to identify certain factors, such as with respect to the learners' insight into their own language and L2, and answer the question whether the performance of an assigned linguistic action is L1-specific or universal. Regarding this last provision, researchers consider that L1-specific or L1-based perception is likely to detain pragmatic transfer, whereas the universal-based is likely to encourage it. Takahashi (2010) provides more explanation on account of this phenomenon and lays down the basis for investigating it further.

Furthermore, as mentioned in the first section of this chapter that transfer deals with psycholinguistic proportions, Takahashi contended for dealing with this occurrence in independent researches that follow a distinctive design. In earlier works, Takahashi (1992; 1993) addressed this concern in a straightforward manner when dealing with transferability of indirect requests from Japanese into English. The

task was accomplished by assigning the participants indirectly-performed requests in Japanese and English in four different situations. The learners were asked to fill in an appropriate judgment task and their performance or outcome of the study in L1 was compared with their production or performance in L2; then, the transferability rate was attained via statistical measures. For American native speakers, this decisive distinction is based on the status-equal and status-unequal relationships, regardless of direction (high to low or low to high). Following the context of modifying an interlocutor's statement, Takahashi and Beebe (1993) found indication for a different L1-influenced design of style-shifting in Japanese learners of English, depending on the speaker's higher or lower status vis-a-vis the hearer. To date, there is only one study that focuses explicitly on how the pragmatic knowledge is transferred from mother tongue into the target language was conducted by Takahashi (1996). She examined five conventionally indirect request strategies in four contexts to investigate the phenomenon of transferability from Japanese to English. Native speakers of Japanese provided rating-scale judgments, in English and Japanese, of the pragmatic acceptability of each request strategy in each context. Transferability was operationally defined as transferability rate, obtained by subtracting the acceptability rate of an English request strategy from the acceptability rate of its Japanese equivalent. Takahashi found that the transferability of the examined conventionally indirect request strategies was highly context-dependent.

Takahashi and Dufon (1989) suggested that in requesting, Japanese learners of English transfer an L1-based pattern of bimodal distribution of indirectness, not matched by American English requestive behavior: (1) when explicit reference was made to the requestive goal, learners preferred more direct strategies than Americans; (2) when the requestive goal was referred to implicitly, less direct strategies were opted for than by L2 speakers. This study was much debated and criticized in addressing this issue, despite the fact that the researcher herself had acknowledged the shortcomings of the design. Therefore, the paucity of research in that area is what led pragmatic transferability to have the status of the neglected area of ILP. Among the prominent inadequacies of the studies dealing with the conditions of transfer is the fact that they rely on learners' perception of a particular speech act performance whether it is universal or L1-specific.

Similarly, transfer from L1 might result in an over-use of certain forms and functions of L1 in the use of L2. Blum-Kulka and Sheffer (1993, p. 219) argued that

“ironically, while pragmatic competence is the most difficult aspect of language to get mastery in a second language, it seems also to be, under certain conditions of bilingualism, ... the easiest to lose in the first language”. Thus, summarizing the main idea of pragmatic transfer should be viewed from different perspectives investigating different ways in which a language might influence the use and acquisition of a second language depends on the conditions in which pragmatic transfer takes place. To this end, Takashi (1996, p. 212) contends that it becomes very difficult to “discern whether observed performance is attributable to L1 transfer, IL over-generalisation, or instructional effects (transfer of training)”. The main idea behind all this could be that if non-native speaker knows the pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatic similarities and differences between native language and the target language, then negative transfer can be minimized. Below, a review of literature has been presented in order to trace the study of direct and indirect discourse strategies with reference to interlanguage studies in the realization of speech acts of apology, request and refusals.

2.2 Direct and Indirect Discourse Strategies

The need to study insights of indirectness and politeness from a cross-cultural view was originally motivated by work carried out within a project investigating realization patterns of requests and apologies in different languages. Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (henceforth, CCSARP by Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989; Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984) aims at investigating the realization of different speech acts in eight different languages. The primary aim of the project was to look for intra-lingual, situational, as well as cross-linguistic variation in the use of these two speech acts. Moreover, cross-culture pragmatics tries to find out if given request patterns are perceived as similarly direct or indirect across languages or not. The interpretation of observed cross-cultural variation in the use of requests raises a second concern such as: How does the categorization in terms of directness carry cross-culturally equivalent social meanings? In other words, do similar levels of directness in different languages necessarily carry the same social meaning? Could direct patterns be considered polite in a given situation in one culture but impolite in the same situation in another? On the other hand, the ever-increasing in-depth study of cultural diversity in the United States and the increasing recognition of differing speech patterns owing to cultural and contexts in sociolinguistics and cross-cultural communication, the 1990s have witnessed a renewed interest in the study of writing

or speaking across cultures. Direct strategies are realized via explicit linguistic devices. Structural or conventional indirect strategies are realized via linguistic devices that refer to the contextual preconditions required for its performance, as is the convention in a particular language. Pragmatic or non-conventional indirect requests are realized via linguistic devices that are needed for the performance of the act or by resorting to contextual cues. This level is realized by hints.

The inappropriate transference of speech act strategies from LI to L2 is a frequent cause of pragmalinguistics failure (e.g., using a direct speech act where a native speaker would use an indirect speech act or 'off-record' politeness strategy (Brown & Levinson 1978, p. 216). It seems plausible to assume that Leech's axes are 'universal' in that they do seem to capture the types of consideration likely to govern pragmatic choices in any language, the way in which they are applied varies considerably from culture to culture. Sociopragmatic decisions are social before they are linguistic, and while foreign learners are fairly amenable to corrections which they regard as linguistic, they are justifiably sensitive about having their social (or even political, religious, or moral) judgment called into question. For instance, in a student's own culture, teachers may have a rather higher status than they do (a social judgment), leading the student to behave more deferentially than would normally be expected (sociopragmatic failure).

Therefore, it can be inferred that directness and indirectness are highly cultural. That is why, an exploration into direct and indirect discourse strategies was deemed very appropriate for the study of pragmatic transfer amongst Pashtu and Saraiki learners of English language. Several proposals have been put forward by different researchers regarding refusal strategies (such as: Rubin, 1983; Beebe et al., 1990; Turnbull & Saxton, 1997), among them the most significant and celebrated is the one expounded by Beebe, Takahashi and Uliss-Weltz (1990). They classified these strategies into semantic formulas, which could be either direct or indirect (i.e., those jargons used to perform a refusal) and adjuncts (i.e., those lexical items which accompany a refusal but which cannot be used alone to accomplish a refusal). Drawing on this cataloging, Salazar et al. (2009) presented taxonomy for the analysis of the learners' making a refusal by approving a conversational perspective. Most importantly, the semantic formulas are divided into direct and indirect strategies where direct strategies include two main subtypes: i) bluntness, which requires the use

of a “no” or the use of a performative verb, and ii) negation of proposition, which encompasses expressions that comprehend negations.

On the other hand, indirect strategies are divided into seven main subtypes: i) plain indirect, which indicate those expressions that alleviate the refusal; ii) reason or explanation, in which the refuser mentions the reason why he/she is unable to comply with the request; iii) regret or apology, in which the refuser feels an offence for rejecting the request; iv) alternative, which includes a selection of choice; v) disagreement/dissuasion/criticism, in which the refuser sternly disagrees with the action of asking or dissuades the requester from asking; vi) statement of principle/philosophy, in which the refuser uses indicators of moral beliefs to avoid the execution of the request; and vii) avoidance, which contains non-verbal avoidance, in which the refuser simply overlooks the request by maintenance of silence and verbal avoidance, in which the refusal is transmitted by using hedges to change the topic.

Speakers learning a new language always maintain certain strategies during their conversation. Following this vein of thought, studies reveal that mother tongue directness strategies are incorporated in making a request, demonstrating the learners' NL pragmatic choice by means of indirect strategies in such situations where Hebrew as a TL requires more directness (Blum-Kulka, 1982; 1983). Similarly, House & Kasper (1987) documented the same phenomenon in Danish and German subjects of learning British English in which direct German linguistic forms are used in the realization of the speech act of complaint in English (DeCapua, 1989). In other words, the level of being very direct or indirect is connected with the level of want for something among the Japanese (Takahashi & Dufon, 1989; Beebe et al, 1990). In the accomplishment of a speech act with a strong wish for something, the Japanese relied more on directness strategies than the Americans did; on the other hand, when a desire is understood, an inclination to less indirect request strategies has been found than the Americans (Takahashi & Dufon, 1989).

In this connection, numerous scholars predominantly those in the West (Kaplan, 1966; Scollon, 1991; Matalene, 1985; Jia, 1987, Fagan & Cheong, 1987; etc.) on the basis of field observation, empirical data analysis and investigation, argued that Chinese text construction has a profound influence on Chinese writing in English, as well as inclusively on other Oriental English writing and rests on the results that Oriental English writing has the propensity of being indirect. Following this assumption that indirectness seems to be the general preference in Chinese

writings in English, though it might be incongruous to determine that there exists a direct-and-indirect or deductive-and-inductive dichotomy in the organizational patterns between Eastern and Western discourse strategies.

In this regard, Kaplan's leading study (1966) based on the analysis of five types of paragraph development highly recommended that Anglo-European expository essays followed a linear development while essays written in Chinese and other Oriental languages follow a configured expansion, using an indirect approach, like coming to the core of the point somewhere at the end. Making a reference to Yeats, the researcher comments on such a paragraph to be 'turning and turning in a widening gyre' (p.14). The circles or gyres that revolve around the subject and show a variety of peripheral views but the subject is never seen to be used directly. Kaplan's claim was declared debatable by some scholars who claimed that Chinese text organizational structures do not differ noticeably from those of the Anglo-American English text, and this hypothesis of the preference of indirectness in Chinese writing was reinforced by many scholars, such as Matalene (1985), Scollon (1991), Jia (2008), and Wenzhong (1998). In this connection, Matalene (1985) demonstrates that in sample essays composed by Chinese ESL learners in Chinese arguments are often delayed, excess of narration, and use of proclamations that seem contrasting to a Western reader.

Young (1982) further elaborated that Chinese discourse pattern is indirect even in terms of request and business consultations. The inclusive compromise seems to be that one always expresses his/her request or the content point last, and where the argument is coming from. In other words, Chinese writing ends where Anglo-American writing starts. In this vein, Wenzhong (1998) in his article recommends that the Chinese learners of English in China have an over all inclination for inductive style in their writing of letters and requests, though many variables may help to decide as to what degree the writing of request is indirect or otherwise, when one could be using an inductive or deductive approach. In the wide-ranging contrastive periphrastic research investigation related to Japanese, Chinese, Thai, and Korean English, Hinds (1990) asserted that the Oriental writing surveys an organizational pattern which is known as quasi-inductive, in the sense that the main crux of the statement is often buried in the passage which shows that the topic is often not plainly interpreted but implied. In fact, some Chinese scholars had acknowledged the aforementioned indirectness or inductive or quasi-inductive tactic in Chinese writing in English,

which the Western scholars did long ago. They are of the view that the English writing of the Chinese, just like their Chinese writing, inclines to be indirect, indefinite, recurring, and often the main idea is suspended till the end and their English writing often displays at the outset introductory remarks which are known as situational comments, emotive build-up, face work or statement of validation so as to lessen the annoyance on and hostility with the reader/listener.

In her study, Blum-Kulka (1982) asserted that the learners of Hebrew transfer to L2 the forms that indicate a conventionalized requestive purpose in English but are unable to transfer and apply the same requestive force in Hebrew. For instance, formally formulated corresponding modal verbs were transmitted by Danish learners into their German L2, who awkwardly failed to accomplish the projected requestive function (Faerch & Kasper, 1989). Among these studies, Blum-Kulka (1982) found comparatively systematic NL transfer pertaining to indirectness established in L2 directives with some comprehension into the substantial integration of L1 in second language learning. Based on the study of Morgan (2004), Blum-Kulka (1982) forwarded a hypothesis stating that the nature of interconnectedness between the established conventions of language, and the conventions about the use of language vary systematically across languages, although the social justification of indirectness is based on universal doctrines, as asserted by Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987). Specifically, thus, it focuses on "conventional indirect directives" discussed in Searle (1975), e.g., "Can you pass the salt?" or "I would like you to go now" (p. 65). Furthermore, it has been elaborated by Blum-Kulka who had equated indirect strategies or indirectness illustrated in directives performed by native English speakers and native Hebrew speakers, and English learners of Hebrew using 17-item discourse completion tests. The findings have affirmed claim to support the hypothesis on the use of established conventions. Therefore, findings of the transfer of L1 sociolinguistic norms concerning indirectness are also presented below.

However, it was noted that the learners in any given context deviate often from the conventional norms of TL native speakers in the accomplishment of directives by using a form which is not the one much accepted or appreciated by native speakers. Most importantly, in the performance of directives, native English speakers were not as much direct as native Hebrew speakers; and English learners of Hebrew observed the same pattern of less directness as represented by their L1 (English). Blum-Kulka (1982), therefore, further confirmed that "the interlanguage of speech act realization is

clearly influenced by transfer of social norms from the first language and culture, but that this factor interacts with second language learning acquisition processes in determining the speech act realization of learners" (p.45). In the study of Blum-Kulka (1982), it was traced that both native English speakers and English learners of Hebrew are inclined to opt for more indirect strategies than Hebrew native speakers in the accomplishment of indirect directives.

Considering the study of Takahashi (1987) in which she proposed that Japanese speakers were more inclined to the use of indirect strategies than (American) English native speakers in the performance of directives in their NL when speaking in the target language context. She further stated that this orientation could result due to various sociolinguistic norms of Japanese and Americans with regard to indirectness. Likewise, it is contended that Japanese learners of English are to be inspired by transfer of Japanese sociolinguistic norms and values with respect to indirectness, i.e., the ostensible greater degree of indirectness in Japanese than in English. In so doing, Takahashi extended the term "indirect directives" grounded in the indirect speech act theory, paying a particular attention to Leech's (1980, 1983) Tact Maxim theory, which binds a positive correlation between tact and indirectness as follows:

Indirect directives are the illocutionary acts by which the speaker attempts to get the hearer to take some action beneficial to the speaker him-/herself while realizing the distance between what the speaker literally says and what he/she pragmatically means, i.e. indirectness, which is chiefly motivated by the speaker's desire to avoid conflict with the hearer. The realization of that distance is specifically made by means of the speaker's tact in giving the hearer certain options in response to the speaker's conflict avoidance strategy; and the types of option in response determine the degree of indirectness, the systematic whole of which is eventually characterized by a scalar phenomenon (Takahashi, 1987, p. 66).

In order to gain a conclusive evidence of transfer, it might also be sensible for the researchers in the field to compare and contrast the data with the interlanguage performance of speakers at different stages of proficiency from different L1 groups who are simultaneously acquiring the same L2. However, due to a dearth of relevant data, this contrast will not be followed, but rather will be a recommendation in the area for future research. In the following section, a debate has been generated on the

available research on the speech acts of apology, request and refusal thereby leading to a gap in the existing literature. Furthermore, a survey has been conducted that provides a brief sketch of studies done so far in the field of ILP.

2.3 Brief Survey of Available Studies on Interlanguage on Speech Acts

A multitude of studies related to transfer have been conducted in the past. These studies investigate the phenomenon related to the transfer of linguistic resources in the production and realization of speech acts. A brief summary of the researches which have contributed to strengthen the field of ILP is given below:

2.3.1 Studies on Speech Acts

The study of speech acts goes back to Austin (1962) which is a collection of lectures that were given at Harvard University in 1955. Austin initiated those lectures by saying:

What shall I have to say here is neither difficult nor contentious; the only merit I shall like to claim is that of being true, at least in parts?

The phenomenon to be discussed is very widespread and obvious and it cannot fail to have been noticed, at least here and there, by others.

Yet have not found attention paid to it specifically (1962, p. 1).

In this regard, Cohen and Olshtain (1981) studied how Hebrew speakers learning English as a second language accomplish their communicative acts with the help of interlanguage. By this, the study demonstrated the transfer of Hebrew speech features integrated into the realization of apology making. Different from Kasper, (1992) who investigated the discourse accent pattern of Spanish-speaking English learners. She demonstrated that Spanish learners of English as a second language maintained a communicative style what was comprehended as communicatively suitable L1 style in English. Furthermore, House (1988) resonated Scarcella (1979) by replicating her scientific study with her German subjects learning British English. It was found that during the realization of the speech act of apology; German-speaking learners of English were detected to have transferred their German communicative patterns, for these learners showed less inclination towards the use of monotonous apology expressions such as “sorry” as resonates by the British English speakers.

Garcia (1989) conducted a study with Venezuelan Spanish speakers on the realization of the speech act of apology. Altogether different from the studies

mentioned above, it was revealed that the Venezuelans are more inclined to positive politeness strategies by saying something in a polite manner so as to prompt their openness or good feelings; on the other hand, the native Spanish speakers were found applying more negative styles such as self-effacing. Investigating the act of refusals, Beebe, Takahashi and Weltz (1990) conducted a study with the Japanese learners of English as a second language who were found stressing the necessity for status differences in the interaction, while the Americans bluntly rejected the presence of such differences even if the differences existed. Politeness was investigated among the Japanese ESL learners by Takahashi and Beebe (1993) who found that their Japanese participants turned to discard positive comments in situations where the Americans employed them. Moreover, the Japanese employed formulaic expressions more than the Americans who denied them.

Takahashi and Beebe (1993, p.138-157) thoroughly investigated the performance of correction in their study of Japanese ESL learners. According to them, the Japanese learners shifted communicative styles clearly manifested and influenced by transfer from their NL. This transfer truly indicates the influence of native sociopragmatic norms, opted for more communicative styles than American participants in performing refusing and disagreeing. Blum-Kulka (1982, 1983) conducted an investigation on some Hebrew learners of English as L2 in the realization of the speech act of apology. She revealed that English learners of Hebrew transferred their pragmalinguistic forms in a negative manner through their Hebrew ability such as (“can you”), and in the selection of the level of directness in request realization. Thus, Blum-Kulka inferred that obvious similarity in form and function across languages did not hold true for all contexts.

Trosborg (1987) conducted another study among Danish learners of English by the way of role-play technique focusing on apology realization. He discovered certain evidence pertaining to the frequency and usage of apology semantic formulas identical to Danish native speakers. In a study on Japanese learners’ use of indirect strategies in their speech, Takahashi and Dufon (1989) voted for and set a test with the help of role-play technique. The study presented an argument that the transfer had much resemblance with precise goals of interaction. For example, the Japanese rely more on directness strategies than the Americans do; if the desire is very much implicit, they were inclined to use fewer indirect request strategies than the Americans. Bergman & Kasper (1993) investigated apology realization among some

Thai learners of English by means of developing different 20 DCT situations. The results validated that half of the yielded responses were on the transfer side.

As a matter of fact, the above-mentioned studies were indirect in nature, yet they were able to report some of the negative pragmatic transfer encompassing certain characteristics in the learners' language. Studies related to speech act realization have at a small scale highlighted the ILP research in five different ways. Firstly, it was proposed that even those learners who have acquired balanced proficiency were found less inclined to the established conventions of form and meaning used by native speakers in the performance of a particular linguistic action. Secondly, there was a huge difference between learners' and native speakers' underlying sociopragmatic perceptions of analogous speech events that were analytically related to differences in their speech act performance. At the third phase, pragmatic transfer at both pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatic levels strongly persisted at higher levels of proficiency. Fourthly, the learners produced more irrelevant speech than native speakers did when the task was less challenging to their control skills. Fifthly, researchers should pay a vigilant attention to the limitations of different data collection tools on learners' performance (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993). It is essential here to bring light to the selected speech acts of the present study below:

2.3.2 Studies on Speech Act of Apology

It is essential here to discuss the speech acts in detail to present an argument for the study. Among early studies, Cohen and Olshtain (1981) introduced the strategies adopted during the accomplishment of speech acts. They explored the performance of Hebrew ESL learners linking it with that of Hebrew and English native speakers (henceforth, NSs). In order to collect reliable data, role-plays were used as data collection method. The researchers found that the learners were unaware of suitable L2 linguistic forms used to convey the communicative intents. It was found that the learners were also unaware of the social norms of L2 that deficiently affected the speech act of apologizing in TL as they were asked using certain situations to apologize boss for forgetting to attend a meeting scheduled with: they offered to reschedule another meeting by saying—I think I can have another meeting with you. This is an explicit defilement of the target sociocultural norm. Taking into consideration the strategy of responsibility, L2 learners use utterances like—we forgot about the meeting; the use of we (association marker) convey an illustration that learners assign a partial responsibility to the boss under the influence of L1 transfer of

sociopragmatic or pragmalinguistics norms. Learners were also found involved in the risk of pragmatic failure as they used other utterances, in apologizing to a friend, like — ‘I really’, ‘very sorry’. ‘I just forgot’. ‘I fell asleep’. ‘Understand’. The use and interpretation of understand (with rising intonation) is a direct translation from L1. It is used as a call for cooperation (solidarity) between interlocutors, but its use in L2 may bring opposite effect as it sounds impolite for English sensibilities. In the similar vein of thought, Bergman and Kasper’s (1993) study using data from Thai ESL learners and American English NSs, made an attempt to explore the perception and the performance of NSs and NNSs. The informants were 30 NSs and 423 NNSs; all were university students. It was found that the Thai and American participants were corresponding in their perception of the relationships between context-internal factors and the lack of interrelation between the context-external factors.

Moreover, the accomplishment of all speech acts, particularly the accomplishment of apologies varies across languages and cultures as they are culture and context-specific (Shahrokhi & Jan, 2012). Every speech act is accomplished in a different manner across different cultures which also stand true for apologizing and the possibility of the transfer of L1 pragmatics (Saleem, Azam & Saleem, 2014) to the target language has a strong probability. Apologies are the true indicators of either regretting a committed offence or the doer of an action is well aware of the fact that certain offense has been occurred in the due course of the act which is not appropriate. Thus, apologies in general are viewed as post events. In other words, seeking an apology (Sadeghi, 2013) contends that the speaker or the one who committed an offense realizes and admits the fact that certain violation of either linguistic form or social norm has been bluntly violated or occurred, and the performer of the act of apology is at least involved to a possible extent in its cause. Likewise, apology strategies (Gowasa, Radiana & Afifah, 2019) also embody in general the loss of face of face at the speaker’s end, but also extend a support at the hearer’s end. While elaborating the speech acts, Cohen and Olshtain (1981) opine that that speech act of apology is mostly accomplished through explicit utterances conveying the purpose of regret over the committed offence known as illocutionary force indicating devices (hereafter, IFID). These strategies comprise performative verbs such as “be sorry,” “apologize,” or “excuse” which reflect an immediate regret, hence, considered being direct apologies.

Taking the case of English into consideration, studies in the past have found the direct apologies commonly used as a strategy are the most widely acknowledged apology strategies. For instance, Blum- Kulka and Olshtain (1984) demonstrate clearly in their project that apologies are expressed in the form of regret for an action. In contrast, it is not necessary that an apology must include a performative verb or an IFID, but seeking an apology can also be executed through the use of a variety of statements and strategies that can be used to convey the meaning of a speech act (Searle, 1976; Sykes & Cohen, 2018). It is true only in the case of indirect apologies which can be accomplished in different manners. In the same manner, Cohen and Olshtain (1983) divided the apologies into sub types of indirect apologies which can be performed thereby ensuring a provision of an explanation or an acknowledgement of the fact of committed action, offer of repair and a promise of forbearance. Thus, an explanation seeks a way for an action of a speaker which could also be used as a strategy for apologizing in an indirect manner. Previous research (e.g., Krulatz, 2018; Sadeghi, 2013) indicates that the use of appropriate strategies of apology is essential for interlocutors in order to establish the intended purpose of communication in a given social context (Kanik, 2017) and avoid the situations having the potential of leading to pragmatic failure (Thomas, 1984; Trosborg, 2011). Furthermore, gender, proficiency level in target language, and age too has a significant impact on the realization of speech acts (Li & Suleiman, 2017; Qari, 2019; Sultana & Khan, 2014). Previous studies on apology strategies (e.g., Adrefiza & Jones, 2013; Wu & Wang, 2016) show that learners' pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic repertoires are not only context dependent but are also a part of an ongoing process (e.g., Ghazzoul, 2019) of the target language learning. However, the realization of apologies through various strategies has yet to explore among Pashtu and Saraiki speaking undergraduate ESL learners.

Furthermore, Jung (2004) investigated IL apologies of Korean ESL learners using role-play as a means for data collection. The participants of this study were 10 Korean ESL undergraduate students performing two sets of role-plays in English and Korean in order to collect both IL and L1 data and 10 American English NSs. The results advocated that proficiency is not positively associated with L2 performance. Furthermore, English NSs and IL-users differed in the use of pragmatic appropriateness. In other words, Korean learners showed verbose transfer of L1 linguistic and pragmatic knowledge and displayed lack of awareness of the social

norms as well as language means related to the apologetic behaviour. For instance, they used apology strategy as frequent as NSs, but often with inappropriate linguistic forms. In addition, they were not able to use explanation as a strategy briefly and effectively in L2 and, thus, fell in verbosity by the utter violation of the maxim of quantity. As for the acknowledgement strategy, it was underused; the researcher related this to the influence of L1, and more frequently, the uncertainty about L2 sociolinguistic rules.

2.3.3 Studies on Speech Act of Request

Fukushima and Iwata (1987) investigated the speech act of request and this study is placed among the early studies on requests (Cohen, 1998). Furthermore, these researchers compared the requestive strategies used by 18 Japanese and 28 English NSs in USA and Japan. The results showed that the semantic formulae used by Japanese and Americans were, on the whole, the same. These sequences were thoroughly identified and the differences were marked by stating that Japanese used sociocultural strategies and sociolinguistic expressions which were dependent on the status of the interlocutors, whereas the expressions and strategies used by the Americans did not vary.

Another cross-cultural study that deals with English and Japanese speakers is that of Fukushima (1996). The researcher employed written incitements (written situations) which the informants had to read and reply to orally. The produced oral responses were recorded and transcribed. The subjects of the study were 60 British English speakers (henceforth, Ss), and 50 Japanese Ss. It was shown in the results that the higher the social status, the more politeness markers were used by the selected English and Japanese speakers. The British participants were inclined to the use of conventional forms, whereas the Japanese were found inclined to direct forms. The use of directness by the Japanese is, for the researcher, linked to the fact that among in-group members' solidarity is highly valued; thus, positive politeness and going on-record are the preferred strategies.

Al-Ali and Alawneh (2010) investigated Arab learners' requestive performance. The researchers, via the tool of DCTs collected data from 45 Jordanian learners of English and 45 American English NSs while using the strategies of modification. The authors proposed three main factors that influenced IL performance: language ability, L2 pragmatic knowledge and the transfer of L1 cultural norms. Learners use the same strategies as NSs, but with different

disseminations in terms of content and frequency. The authors interpret this as a lack of pragmatic knowledge. The over-use of long-winded requests employed to minimize imposition suggests that Jordanians are less direct (they use more justifications before requesting) than Americans. Also, the researchers trace the evidence of cross-cultural differences in terms of style; the Americans give a high priority to propositional content (what the request is about), i.e., opting for egalitarianism in order not to sound subservient, whereas Jordanians seem to emphasize the interpersonal relationship with the requestee than the request itself via apologizing and denying requests.

The most utilized and well-known request strategy classification is the Cross-Cultural Speech Acts Realization Project (CCSARP) by Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984). In analyzing acts of requesting in English, the CCSARP is not outdated (Thuruwan & Yunus, 2017). Thus far, the framework offers a fundamental guide in examining requests across culture (Jalilifar, 2009; Yazdanfar & Bonyadi, 2016) and in many English as a foreign language (EFL) context (Cunningham, 2017; Daskalovska, Ivanovska, Kusevska, & Ulanska, 2016; Hu, 2014; Nugroho, 2019). As request is categorized into a face threatening act, English speakers employ various strategies to either strengthen or mitigate their requests. The CCSARP distinguishes the request strategies into three: direct, conventionally indirect and non-conventionally indirect (Blum-kulka & Olshtain, 1984). Furthermore, it highlights request strategies in each three levels of directness.

Nevertheless, to learn a language properly, students also require getting beyond the textbooks provided in the classroom, and understand the cultural aspect as well. Studies on levels of directness in L2 English learners' requests (e.g., Daskalovska, Ivanovska, Kusevska & Ulanska, 2016; Al-Gahtani & Alkahtani, 2012) have investigated in a variety of studies. This said, research on levels of directness in request strategies within the Swedish context is scarce and this study aims to fill this research gap. Against this background, this study will investigate the ability of Swedish students of English to produce appropriate levels of directness in their request strategies in the target language. Request perspectives in the results will also be analysed as an addition to politeness. This study may thus provide insights into the language learners' pragmatic competence (Chen, 2017).

On the other hand, successful intercultural communication entails the knowledge of grammatical forms and the ability of using language functions

appropriately in a real social context. Thus, English as foreign language (EFL) teaching aims to equip learners with the concept of communicative competence, consisting of grammatical knowledge and pragmatic competence (Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei & Thurrell, 1995). In the recent years, scholars (Hu, 2014; Li, Suleiman, & Sazalie, 2015; Ortactepe, 2012) point out that EFL learners encounter difficulty and challenge in acquiring pragmatic competence and communicating appropriately in different social interactions because of their lacks of language function and cross-cultural knowledge. This issue becomes crucial since this limitation is potentially to cause communication breakdowns when interacting with native speakers because they tend to interpret the pragmatic failures as arrogance and rudeness (Li, Suleiman, & Sazali, 2015). Thus, for this reason, examining the development of pragmatic competence of EFL learners has become an interesting inquiry. Having discussion about pragmatic competence cannot surely be separated from the idea of speech acts. A speech act, initiated by Searle (1969), in philosophy of language and linguistics means an utterance that not only expresses an information, but also carries out an action (Aitchison, 2003; Yule, 1996). In the context of global communication where different cultures are interacting, the emergence of utterances containing speech acts, which serve different communicative functions to reach certain purposes, often take place (Sattar & Suleian, 2009). To communicate appropriately among different cultures, English language teaching should accommodate the learners' need of language functions and cross-cultural understanding (Jazeri & Nurhayati, 2019). Therefore, EFL learners should be well equipped with the knowledge of pragmatic competence and language function. Searle (1969) stated that all speech acts are intending to some degree, and understanding the intention that often becomes a problem. For instance, a question such as "can you close the door?" is not merely a yes-or-no question, but indicates an indirect request. Because of its crucial role in communication, the study of speech act of requests still becomes an interesting issue among the researchers (Maros & Halim, 2018). For the purpose of this study, speech act theory will provide insights on Indonesian EFL learners' request strategies so as their reasons of employing such strategies. The act of requesting has long received scholars' attention since it belongs to the face threatening acts.

To understand how speech acts of requests are realized in different languages, the Blum-Kulka and Olshtain's Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) was conducted in various languages (i.e., Hebrew, Danish, and German).

Since then, a number of cross-cultural pragmatic studies have been conducted across different languages by implementing the same patterns or by adapting it (Daskalovska, Ivanovska, Kusevska, & Ulanska, 2016; Güneş & Ortaçtepe, 2019; Yazdanfar & Bonyadi, 2016). In Indonesian context, some comparative studies have been carried out to investigate how Indonesian EFL speakers realize speech acts of requests (e.g., Nugroho, 2019; Susilo, 2015; Sari, Raja, & Sudirman, 2015; Syahri & Kadarisman, 2007). These studies revealed similar results that Indonesian EFL speakers performed linguistic means to communicate but they mostly employed conventionally indirect requests in almost all situations and contexts as their strategies. While these aforementioned previous studies relied on Discourse Completion Task (DCTs) to examine the requesting acts of Indonesian EFL learners, there is a need of utilizing more authentic measurements in the pragmatic literatures such as Oral Discourse Completion Task (ODCTs) and Role-plays to support the results obtained from DCTs.

Although this study employs Role-plays, however, its contribution to the realm of pragmatics is not the use of another model of data collection tool. Instead, the present study examines Indonesian EFL learners' reasons behind their choices of request strategies. Investigating their reasons is crucial to do to reveal Indonesian EFL learners' perceptions and attitudes toward the existing theory of cross-cultural request realization patterns developed by Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984). Initially, a study in this issue had been conducted by Nugroho (2019) by investigating Indonesian ESP teachers' reasons of utilizing certain request strategies and Sumarti and Widodo (2019) by interpreting non-conventionally indirect requests in Haikyuu. Nevertheless, the researchers argue that an inquiry on why Indonesian EFL learners realize their request strategies should be clearly examined since the two studies did not reveal speakers' perceptions from EFL learners' point of view. Also, the present study contributes as a comparative study to enrich the theories of pragmatic competence and speech acts. Accordingly, this descriptive qualitative study is carried out to fill the gap by delineating how Indonesian EFL learners realize requests in English so as by examining their reasons of employing the strategies.

Pragmatic competence, which is an essential part of communicative competence, is the ability to appropriately perform language functions in real context of social interactions (Pinyo, 2010; Yazdanfar & Bonyadi, 2016). For long years, before the emergence of communicative competence models, English language

teaching had been equated with grammatical knowledge and vocabulary memorization (Nugroho, 2019), thus, the pragmatic competence of the language seems to be put aside (Güneş & Ortaçtepe, 2019). However, it was proven that the mastery of grammatical knowledge and vocabulary was not sufficient for successful communication in real social contexts (Widanta, Hudiananingsih, Sitawati & Ardika, 2019). Therefore, to be communicatively competent, English speakers are required to have the ability of performing appropriate language functions based on the real context of communication.

Most of the relevant research has been conducted in the field of interlanguage pragmatics, primarily in the form of single moment studies (Blum-Kulka and Levenston, 1987; Niki & Tajika, 1994; Biesenbach-Lucas, 2007; Woodfield, 2008; Woodfield & Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2010; Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2012), although there are a few developmental (Ellis, 1992), predominantly cross-sectional (Pinto, 2005; Félix-Brasdefer, 2007; Lin, 2009) studies that mention request perspective as well. These interlanguage studies have provided some insight into learners' choices of perspective, in comparison with the perspectives preferred in the target language. Cross-cultural request studies (e.g., Blum-Kulka, 1989; Márquez Reiter, 2000; Ogiermann, 2009a), on the other hand, have illustrated the preferences for request perspective in various languages, thus helping interpret the choices made by L2 learners with these L1 backgrounds.

Thus, the learners' poor language ability is displayed in insufficient language proficiency in the L2. As for the lack of pragmatic knowledge, Jordanian learners lack the ability to use appropriate devices in a fitting manner. For pragmatic transfer, at the pragmalinguistics level, learners' over-initiate requests by expressions like excuse me (from Arabic *afwan*) and hello (from Arabic *marhaba*). Moreover, it was found that Jordanians also transfer certain sociopragmatic expressions like those of gratitude, well-wishing, obligation, etc., which are typical to the Jordanian culture. Such tendency in speaking may sound gushy to the American. Nonetheless, the authors suggest that transfer needs not be perceived as a barrier to successful communication. The speech act of refusal is discussed in the next section.

2.3.4 Studies on Speech Act of Refusal

Refusals are performed as a response to other speech acts such as offers, invitations, suggestions and requests; the speech act of refusal indicates that one is not willing to comply with something. However, in order to perform the speech act of

refusal, and to be performed without defects, the act of accomplishment must meet certain conditions. Moreover, the speech act of refusal is one of the face threatening acts in communication. They are compound in the sense that an intervention of face is actualized by taking turns between the speaker and the hearer.

The speech act of refusal as a response to request is classified by Felix-Brasdefer (2004) as: (1) pre-refusals: strategies that initiate the refusal negotiation and make the recipient ready for a forthcoming refusal; (2) head acts: the minimal unit to realize refusals; (3) post-refusals: strategies that follow the head act, emphasizing, justifying, mitigating, or concluding the refusal response. If a direct strategy of a refusal was present, it was coded as the head act; otherwise, the first indirect strategy (e.g., reason/explanation, regret, repetition) in the sequence was coded as the head act of the refusal. Moreover, the strategies used before or after the refusal head act were coded as pre- or post-refusals. In addition, each refusal interaction consisted of two episodes: first, refusal in response to the initiating act by the researcher (i.e., invitation), followed by negotiation of the refusal in response to insistence by the researcher.

On the other hand, offers, invitations, suggestions and requests pose a threat to the hearer's negative face by impeding their independence; refusals pose a threat to the hearer's positive face by implying that their wants are not desirable. In this case, the person who refuses encounters a specific challenge. In order to be polite, he needs to save his negative face as well as alleviate the threat his refusal poses to his interlocutor's positive face. Consequently, in order to "save face", speakers employ various strategies to negotiate the interaction with their interlocutor (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 62-68). Upon the classification of the speech act of refusal, Beebe et al. (1990) have categorized different components of refusal strategies, such as direct refusals, indirect refusals and adjuncts. Direct refusals are precise and clear in meaning (e.g., no, I can't come tonight), while indirect refusals include mitigation devices to save the hearer's positive face. In addition, adjuncts are remarks used to mitigate refusals, but could not stand alone to function as a refusal. Similarly, the interlocutors during the accomplishment of the speech act of refusal desire to consider the illocutionary force to avoid the use of negative face instead mitigate to convey the intended meaning via the communicative intent in order to minimize the size of imposition involved in the act.

2.3.5 Studies on Interlanguage

At the very outset of the 21st century, eminent pragmaticians (e.g., Alcón & Martínez-Flor, 2005, 2008; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Kasper & Rose, 2002; Martínez Flor et al., 2003; Rose & Kasper, 2001; Tatsuki, 2005) showed a greater interest in the area of interlanguage pragmatics to examine how learners' pragmatic competence in a second (L2) or foreign (FL) language is perceived and comprehended. Since long, pragmatic language use has been considered a multifaceted phenomenon with a lot of contextual factors affecting speech production in its actual performance; it is taken of paramount significance to sensibly devise such methods that clearly provoke learners' production or comprehension/awareness of a particular pragmatic feature in a given situation.

As a matter of fact, it is a strenuous process in pragmatic research to collect appropriate data which has always been a critical issue in the area since the use of a particular elicitation technique may hypothetically influence research products (Alcón & Martínez-Flor, 2008; Nurani, 2009). Due to this reason, consistent improvements pertaining to the development of research methodology in the area of pragmatics have been documented in the studies of (Bardovi-Harlig, 1999; Cohen et al., 2004; Felix-Brasdefer, 2010; Kasper, 2000; Kasper & Dahl, 1991; Roever, 2005). Similarly, Trosborg (2010) stated that though there is still a long way to further explore this area by broadening the kinds of data collection tools generated to include learners belonging to different linguistic backgrounds.

Tracing back the history of the concept of interlanguage which was primarily announced by Selinker (1972) who defined the term as “a separate linguistic system based on the observable output which results from a learner's attempted production of a Target Language norm” (p. 214). This alignment was, thus, inferred in turn from the Error Analysis Approach (Corder, 1967) which demonstrated that errors indicate important gaps in the learner's learning processes during learning languages. Furthermore, it is a warning note that a careful analysis is more productive from scientific and pedagogic point of view, than the mere counting, labeling or pointing out scoring and sanctioning of ‘wrong’ forms.

Thus, the emergence of Interlanguage as both a method and methodology in the discipline of classic SLA found a prominent place in the area of pragmatics in the 1990s. Since then, as a corresponding discipline of SLA, interlanguage pragmatics investigates how second language (L2) learners develop their ability and competence

to understand and perform pragmatic functions accordingly in a target language. Kasper and Dahl (1991) defined ILP as “referring to nonnative speakers’ comprehension and production of speech acts, and how that L2-related knowledge is acquired” (p.216). Despite the rapidly increasing attention to the processes of acquisition in ILP, the existing researches have primarily focused on pragmatic use of second language but not its development. The lack of developmental orientation in ILP research was first pointed out by Kasper (1992) and lamented in these words:

Unlike other areas of second language study, which are primarily concerned with acquisitional patterns of interlanguage knowledge over time, the great majority of studies in ILP have not been developmental. Rather, focus is given to the ways NNS’ pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatic knowledge differs from that of native speakers (NSs) and among learners with different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. To date, ILP has thus been primarily a study of second language use rather than second language acquisition (Kasper & Schmidt 1996, p. 150).

Keeping this in view, the connection between the occurrence of errors and interlanguage development has emphasized upon the two concepts which theoretically and conceptually fall apart. Bley-Vroman (1983), for instance, warned against the risk of pledging a “comparative fallacy”, arguing that “work on the linguistic description of learners’ language can be seriously stalled or diverted by a concern with the target language” (p. 2). Likewise, Sorace (1996) asserted that if the primary aim is to restructure a learner’s linguistic system, then, “the evaluation of the distance between native and non-native grammars becomes an irrelevant criterion” (p. 386). Researchers, investigating from different perspectives have focused on the impartiality of the concept of interlanguage from those of error and conventionality to L2 norms. In addition, numerous researchers have established sufficient explanations of interlanguage expansion disparaging any orientation to accuracy or errors.

Owing to this statement, Pienemann (1998) recommends the view of “factorization” as a way of extricating numerous factors pushed together in the L2 which leads to ‘errors’. It is further stated that a learner may progress with an interlanguage system in which factors by themselves administer a set of form-function relations, which are not allowed by L2 rules. For example, in a fusional language, adjectives might be modified in terms of gender, number, definiteness or case. A

speaker who associates one inflectional morpheme even with one of these features, e.g., number, will yield many forms contrary to L2 norms, but would support a vibrant interlanguage rule.

Another approach recognized as the “Basic Variety Approach” (henceforth, BVA) has consistently looked at interlanguage development (Klein & Perdue, 1997). The authors have highlighted some merging codes of utterance construction articulated in the early stages of IL development. The main focus is on the mandate in which linguistic elements appear within an utterance and qualify some semantic notions. Based on the widespread database, Perdue (1993) demonstrated the view of these independent codes of L1 and L2, thus referring to the functional explanation of interlanguage development which allows no orientation to errors and conventionality to L2 norms. Therefore, the BVA, as the term suggests, was essentially designed to investigate thoroughly the early stages of second language acquisition. Moreover, it also illustrates that learners’ productions in the target language should be measured according to their strictures of internal logic rather than identifying their conformity to L2 norms. Similarly, Norris and Ortega (2003) proposed that to look into the independent system of interlanguage is more appropriate for initial stages while other types of intersections are more adequate for later stages.

2.3.6 Studies on Interlanguage Pragmatics

In its narrow sense, ILP generally ascribes to NNSs' attribute of understanding and production of speech acts, and how their speech act related knowledge in L2 is acquired, that is, whether it is developed dependently or independently. Among the main participants in the study of interlanguage pragmatics are nonnative speakers, in other words, users or learners of a second language. In this view, Kasper and Rose (2002) broaden the scope and characterization of pragmatics in interlanguage pragmatics by retaining definitions presented by Crystal (1997). As such, these definitions provide supplementary direction for the fields of investigation in interlanguage pragmatics.

Moreover, Crystal (1997) defines the term pragmatics as “the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication” (p. 301). As the term "interlanguage" (IL) itself proposes to include those studies which study

child or adult NNS speech act knowledge and corresponding behavior to the segregation of first language child and adult pragmatics. Similarly, interlanguage pragmatics, a sub discipline of second language research, focuses on how non-native speakers develop an understanding and carries out the linguistic action in the target language and how L2 pragmatic knowledge is being acquired.

The majority of interlanguage pragmatics research has derived its theoretical groundwork, research questions and methods from empirical, particularly from the perspective of cross-cultural pragmatics. These studies demonstrate a critical inquiry into the assumption of whether NNSs differ from NSs such as: how linguistic resources of L1 influence the learning of target language and how these linguistic resources are contextually distributed in performing different speech acts? Secondly, what kinds of strategies, whether direct or indirect, are maintained in interaction? Thirdly, is the particular linguistic token used for conveying particular information with the same effect of similarity and differences? Fourthly, the linguistic action should have the effect of illocutionary meaning and, most importantly politeness and issues related to the studies of different native speech communities (Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989). To date, research on the realization of speech acts has been strongly motivated by psycholinguistic work on the explanation of literal and non-literal meaning (Takahashi, 1990). Thus, interlanguage pragmatics is a part of the sociolinguistics and, also to a smaller range, subscribes to psycholinguistic view of NNS' linguistic action in the production of different communicative acts.

Similarly, interlanguage pragmatics in the second language research paradigm identifies a negative pragmatic transfer least considering its communicative effects as an outcome that would be interactional. On the other hand, sociolinguistics has focused on intercultural miscommunication consequential of discordant conversational styles (e.g., Erickson & Shultz, 1982; Gumperz, 1982; Tannen, 1985). However, this vein of investigation could not hint the development of conversational styles and hence had less contribution in deliberation on pragmatic transfer. For instance, Tannen (1985) worked on the identification of miscommunication that took place during an interaction. Other interactional sociolinguists have also reported that discrepancy in communicative patterns of style does not inevitably have conflictive results but extends a favour in the form of positive outcome.

In this connection, Erickson (1975) demonstrated that indigenous style differences in gatekeeping chance meetings can be counter balanced through

introducing some common underlying agency, or through co-membership built on mutual interests or experience. Moreover, Tannen (1985) concluded with remarks on miscommunication of contextualization prompts which bring about favorable ascriptions to the interlocutor. She further suggested that conversational styles, although different, were supplementing and encouraging with some positive attributes rather than contradictory ones allowing interlocutors to attain their communicative goals and to feel them contented about the interaction. So, interlanguage pragmatics does not need to just look for a deficit hypothesis rather to explore the essential conditions whereby pragmatic transfer occurs, and the conditions essential for deriving different communicative effects of divergent ('negative') transfer that need to be thoroughly examined.

Likewise, interlanguage pragmatics focuses on the study of nonnative speakers' use and acquisition of L2 pragmatic knowledge (Kasper 1996, p. 145). According to Levinson (1983), the study of pragmatics conventionally comprehended five main areas, viz. deixis, conversational implicature, presupposition, speech acts, and conversational structure. A conspicuous feature of this area of research is the boundaries proposed by Kasper and Dahl (1991) elucidating a methodological review for interlanguage pragmatics. Moreover, Kasper and Schmidt (1996) assimilate communicative acts into the definition of interlanguage pragmatics as "the study of the development and use of strategies for linguistic action by nonnative speakers" (p. 150). In this definition, there is an explicit insertion of both 'development' and 'use'. In a study, Kasper (1996) forwards the following account of topics which have been included in interlanguage pragmatics till date. These are:

nonnative speakers' perception and comprehension of illocutionary force and politeness; their production of linguistic action; the impact of context variables on choices of conventions of means (semantic formulae or realization strategies) and forms (linguistic means of implementing strategic options); discourse sequencing and conversational management; pragmatic success and failure; and the joint negotiation of illocutionary, referential, and relational goals in personal encounters and institutional settings (p. 146).

In a way, Kasper (1992) acknowledged five strategies amongst L2 learners, such as, L1 transfer where the mother tongue linguistic resources are utilized during the performance of different communicative acts. Second strategy is transfer of

training that expounds on the conception of transference of L1 knowledge incorporated into L2. The third strategy of L2 learning is simplification as learners do rely on the use of L1 while learning L2 that also creates an ease for learning the established norms and knowledge of L2. Furthermore, the strategies of L2 communication (or communication strategies like circumlocution), where the learners maintain a particular strategic move from L1 to the target language and the most important is the overgeneralization of the target language patterns, which demonstrate the display of target language in different contexts.

Among these identical factors, language transfer is regarded as a significant resource in L2 acquisition. Thus, interlanguage is an ordinary systematic language, replicating the learners' endeavors to acquire the particular language items. Research in the field of ILP has been designed within cross-cultural settings and has been largely subjugated by studies concentrating on presentation or use, rather than on the process of acquisition/development (Kasper & Schmidt 1996; Bardovi-Harlig, 1999). The same is also true of the present study that intends to investigate the actual performance of Pashtu and Saraiki English language learners during the accomplishment of the selected speech acts. The present study gains special guidance about cross-cultural pragmatics from the studies comparing native speakers' (NSs) and non-native speakers' (NNSs) performance of pragmatic features (Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper 1989).

Therefore, it is a challenge for ILP research to incorporate the conceptions presented by cross-cultural pragmatics into theories of language learning. Hymes (1972) sees pragmatic knowledge as a component of 'communicative competence', interacting with socio-cultural knowledge and other types of knowledge, so that the task of a language user in her performance of verbal action "is to select and combine elements from these areas in accordance with his/her illocutionary, propositional and modal (or 'social', 'politeness') goals" (Kasper 1989, p. 39). Regarding acquisition or development of pragmatic abilities, Kasper argues that "pragmatics needs to relate (product) description not only to social processes but also to the psychological processes of speech production/reception, as well as to language learning and acquisition". Likewise, Faerch and Kasper (1985) introduced a cognitive-pragmatic approach in the learning and teaching of a second language implies that procedural aspects of pragmatic knowledge need to be incorporated along with its interaction with declarative knowledge in interlanguage studies.

So, ILP as research methodology embodies the design of cross-cultural investigation. Normally, ILP studies are grounded in three sets of data including samples of speech act production in the target language as natural and real-life utterances made by L2 learners, samples accomplished by native speakers of the target language, and samples accomplished by native speakers of LI. Open role plays testify a much richer data. They characterize oral production, full procedure of the turn-taking mechanism, impromptu planning decisions depending on interlocutor input, and hence, intervention of global and local goals, including negotiation of meaning (in the SLA sense of the term), when required. The interesting potential of open role plays for the study of 1L pragmatics is to detect how speech act accomplishment is successively organized (e.g., in terms of strategy choice and politeness investment), what types of interlocutor responses are prompted by specific strategic choices, and how these responses in turn determine the speaker's next move. Likewise, it has been perceived as to what degree their first languages influence their L2 pragmatic norms and the pattern of strategies followed during the production of a particular speech act is the gap identified by the present study in the previously existing studies. In this regard, studies in the past related to ILP research have used either one of the existing research methodologies, i.e., naturally occurring data, written or oral DCTs, and role plays (Ellis, 1994). Although real-life data is highly regarded for their validity, their use as a basis for directing any ILP research is in trend but it can be treated through the use of limitations of the study to justify the results.

The diverse linguistic and cultural background of the selected Pashtu and Saraiki English language learners is discussed below.

2.4 Pashtu Language and Culture

Pakistan is a multilingual and multiethnic country of South Asia. Majeed (2010) demonstrated that having a predominately Indo-Iranian speaking population, Pakistan has historically and culturally been linked with its neighbours Iran, Afghanistan, and India. The politics of Pakistan is deeply rooted in the politics of linguistic groups. In this regard, Rehman (1995) demonstrated that Pakistan is a multilingual state, where the Pakhtuns, Sindhi, Balochi, Punjabi, Mohajir and Saraiki identities are shaped through Pashtu, Sindhi, Balochi, Punjabi, Urdu and Saraiki languages. It is worth-mentioning here that the ethnic identities of Pakistan espoused

language factor as a powerful tool for proclaiming their power and initiated language movements for defining their identity. For different ethnic groups in Pakistan, language is an amalgamating force and it can also promote and withstand a community sense of its own existence among other symbols of identities. Majeed (2010) extended that the contemporary ethnic rigidities in Pakistan are entrenched in a number of developments: the increasing ethnic heterogeneity of the country's provinces, the growing economic and political interdependence, and the ongoing developments of cultural homogenization as well as the prompt urbanization, and the refining ethnic asymmetries within Pakistan's leading class. These very rapid on-going developments, however, suggest the opportunity for seeking solutions in a multi-ethnic framework.

In Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, the majority of population speaks Pashtu as their first language (L1). Pashtun (also spelled Pushtun, Pakhtun, Pashtuon, and Pathan) are people who have been living in southeastern Afghanistan and the northwestern province of Pakistan. Moreover, Pashtuns are the largest ethnic group in Afghanistan. To date, there is no written record or history of the Pashtun in their own land. They are traditionally and historically pastoral drifters with a strong tribal organization. The tribe is further divided into clans, sub-clans, and patriarchal families. Since long, Pashtun have lived between Khurasan and the Indian subcontinent, at the crossroads of great civilizations. Pashtun consist of about sixty tribes of unreliable sizes. Each tribe occupies its own land.

Regarding Pashtu language that belongs to the Eastern subgroup of the Iranian subfamily of the Indo-European language family, Pashtu is spoken approximately by 50 million people (Ethnologue, 2009). Although exact censuses are not available on record— and in spite of both the several native Pashtu speakers whose heritage is largely multi-ethnic (inter-ethnic marriage is frequent in the region) and non-Pashtu speakers claiming Pashtun heritage—this number is likely to be calculation of the size of the Pashtun ethnic group. Approximately, two-thirds of Pashtuns live in Pakistan (known as ‘Pakhtuns’ or ‘Pathans’), where they constitute an important minority (15-20%).

Expounding on the cultural background, Rehman (1996) maintained that Pashtun culture is grounded in Islam and Pashtunwali, which is a set of cultural and moral values, as well as used in terms of the Pashtu language and wearing Pashtun dress. The culture of the Pashtun people was made prominent and significant at the

time when Alexander the Great discovered Afghan region in 330 BC. The Pashtun culture has little outside guidance and, over the ages, has retained a great extent of purity. It is important to mention that academic research on the subject of Pashtun culture, history and language is very limited. Pashtun history has been passed down orally by past generations. The history of the Pashtun people is a debated subject, as there is no solid written record of Pashtun history or any solid research about where the Pashtuns come from and who they are.

2.5 Saraiki Language and Culture

In simple words, ‘Saraiki’ is the language of the middle Indus valley. ‘Saraiki Movement’ which started in 1960s’ is grounded in the central part of this region, the South-West Punjab, principally in its most important cities, Multan and Bahawalpur. Southern Punjab is also known as the area whereby Saraiki is used as the first language. Majeed (2010) identified that the notion of ethnic nationalism appeared among Saraiki speaking people due to inequality, lack of development, less access to power, goods and services. The sense of insufficiency among Saraiki speaking in the southern Punjab has driven them to the proclamation of a separate identity of which language is the most influential symbol. Moreover, Saraiki language, also spelled Saraiki or Seraiki, is an Indo-Aryan language spoken in Pakistan. The Saraiki-speaking area ranges across the southwestern districts of Punjab province, ranging into adjacent regions of the neighbouring provinces of Sindh, Balochistan, and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

There were 20 million speakers of Saraiki in the early 21st century, but it is scarcely conceivable to launch precise numbers, given official unwillingness to accumulate and publish the pertinent statistics (Ethnologue, 2009). On the other hand, Majeed (2010) demonstrated that this may be ascribed to the consideration of language concerns in Pakistan, particularly including the increasing pressure for official appreciation of Saraiki as a language altogether different from Punjabi, and the subsequent demand for the separation of the main Saraiki-speaking region from Punjab province. These prerogatives are in turn often strongly opposed by those who consider Saraiki as no more than a dialect of Punjabi, thus retaining no right to fuller political acknowledgment. As this might be projected from its geographical position, Saraiki is linguistically intelligible between Sindhi and Punjabi, although generally somewhat closer to the latter in vocabulary. Though there is a reasonably high degree

of mutual intelligibility between Saraiki and Punjabi, Saraiki shares numerous important grammatical structures with Sindhi and that is why it was separately categorized in Sir George Grierson's influential *Linguistic Survey of India* (1903–28) with the latter. Hence, Saraiki is to a fair degree mutually intelligible with Standard Punjabi and shares with it a large percentage of its vocabulary and morphology. In addition, Saraiki is the first language of 20 million people in Pakistan, stretching across southern Punjab, southern Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, and the border areas of northern Sindh and eastern Baluchistan. According to the 1998 census, 12.8 million of those or 92% lived in the province of Punjab.

Furthermore, Asif and Imtiaz (2005) documented that there is no appropriate documentation related to it. Mainly the Saraiki speaker form parts of Southern-most half and Northwest of Punjab, southern districts of Dera Ismail Khan and also in areas of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, the adjacent border areas of Sindh and Baluchistan provinces. People belonging to Bahawalpur, DG Khan, Multan, Sargodha and Dera Ismail Khan speak and use it as their first language. Most importantly, it is also used and spoken extensively as a second language in the Northern and Western areas of Sindh, Karachi and also in some parts of Baluchistan. Moreover, Asif and Imtiaz (2005) assert that the Saraiki people are different in terms of their food habits, dress, folk dances, games, amusement, mindset and psyche. They can be often found reluctant while leaving their homeland as contrary to Punjabis and Pashtuns. Saraiki speakers are unreceptively objective in showing their response or giving their opinion. They are very calculative but slow in their responses. They evaluate an issue dialectically and make their secure opinion, which is last and final.

Below, I provide a discussion on the research gap identified as the result of reviewing the already available researches in the field of ILP.

2.6 Gap in the Existing Literature in Pakistani ESL Classroom Context

This study is designed in the framework of pragmatic transfer, attributed to Kasper (1992) that validates the need on the part of the learners to develop such strategies which are required to carry out the production and comprehension of L2 via mother tongue when learning L2. Based on the above literature discussed in different sections, it can be concluded that there are different aspects of investigating the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer which need to be probed deeper in order to

uncover the process of accomplishment of particular speech acts. As a number of studies (e.g., Blum-Kulka, 1982; 1983; House & Kasper, 1987; Faerch & Kasper, 1989; Takahashi & Dufon, 1989), complaint (DeCapua, 1989), and apology (Cohen & Olshtain, 1981; Olshtain, 1983; Trosborg, 1987; House, 1988; Beebe et al, 1990; Bergman & Kasper, 1993, and negative pragmatic transfer, (Qu & Wang, 2005, Chen & Li, 2016) it has been reported that pragmatic transfer exists among second language learners when they display their linguistic abilities with the help of native tongue influence in the context of target language. Keeping this into consideration, the present study is an attempt to uncover the strategies for directness and indirectness which vary across languages and cultures. Moreover, in order to explore the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer, the current study has made an effort to explore the accomplishment of speech acts of three different types among English language learners belonging to Pashtu and Saraiki language backgrounds respectively.

Apart from this, the present study also investigates the extent to which the learners deviate from the linguistic norms of target language but rely on the incorporation of the established linguistic conventions of their own mother tongue. In other words, they accomplish certain communicative acts in the target language by relying more on the linguistic and cultural norms of their mother tongue. This cross-cultural and cross-linguistic influence may create an ease for the learners in achieving an acceptable level of oral proficiency in the target language but may not help the learners in acquiring the desirable level of pragmatic competence in the target language. As a matter of fact, researches in the past in the field of pragmatics have witnessed this phenomenon with a particular attention to pragmatic transfer and the realization of speech acts. It can be inferred that pragmatic transfer is a usual communicative practice among different communities across the world and these communicative practices vary across cultures and languages. However, the present study explores the evidence of sociopragmatic transfer among Pashtu and Saraiki language speakers who are English language learners, pursuing their undergraduate studies in a university in Pakistan. Learners belonging to these two different linguistic communities have been struggling for achieving an acceptable level of communicative competence through pragmatic transfer.

As this study explores the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer observed among ESL learners belonging to Pashtu and Saraiki backgrounds, a special point of investigation will be the realization of speech acts as they may be displayed

differently due to the different linguistic and cultural background of the speakers. As a step forward, the study also highlights the extent to which the learners are inclined to use pragmatic transfer to gain pragmatic competence in the TL through the influence of mother tongue which is the core premise of the present study. The present study sets out to find out evidence for alleged pragmatic transfer in speech act realizations, such as: apology, request and refusal among Pashtu and Saraiki ESL learners. The study particularly focuses on the role of sociopragmatic norms in pragmatic transfer in the target language productions of the selected ESL learners. To put it differently, the study intends to explore the strategies followed by the non-native speakers which facilitate the selected ESL learners with a substantial level of production in L2. Moreover, the other related issues such as the conditions for pragmatic transfer and the effects of transfer on communicative outcomes will also be addressed in the present study. In short, this chapter provides a brief survey of available literature in the field of ILP and its outcomes are discussed in detail. After this detailed discussion, the section below provides a brief summary of the chapter.

2.7 Summary

A thorough review of relevant literature reveals that language transfer is inevitable in SLA and quite compatible with the phenomenon of interlanguage pragmatics. It seems that, in the recent past, greater significance has been given to the usage of language in ESL/EFL settings. At present, though the communicative approach has become more extensively established in language teaching settings, the focus has moved towards the development of communicative competence, including pragmatic competence of the learners. Furthermore, the review of literature revealed the wide scope of research in the field of pragmatic transfer related to speech act realization and its outcomes considering the form of production in the correct usage of the target language. Studies have also revealed positive outcomes of L1 interference that accommodate learners, and, thus, create an ease in the learning process of the target language. The current study intends to investigate the speech act realization process carried out in different communicative situations by Pashtu and Saraiki English language learners.

The review of literature also reveals that sociopragmatic transfer that is related to the maintenance of social norms and cultural values of mother tongue influences the learning process of second language. In other words, it has been contended that

pragmatic transfer often has positive effects and helps the learners to accomplish communicative acts in the target language context. Moreover, the study of cross-cultural pragmatics highlights that the speakers across different speech communities vary in their linguistic practices and they develop various strategies to accomplish different communicative acts in their linguistic and cultural settings.

The reviewed literature suggests:

- (i) That the previous studies have linked as well as contrasted in order to know how non-native speakers differ from native speakers due to their mother-tongue influences in the realization of speech acts in the TL.
- (ii) That the studies have endeavored to generate a debate on the issues relating to the documentation of differences and similarities, typification of the transferred structures, circumstances of transfer-occurrences, and possible outcomes of such transfers.
- (iii) That Kasper's (1992) attempt to divide pragmatic transfer into pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic transfers was useful in unfolding the learners' transfer data. On the other hand, the dichotomous division was incapable to provide justifications for the communicative styles in the learners' interlanguage data.
- (iv) That the studies of negative pragmatic transfer in interlanguage pragmatics are few in spite of the apparent role of negative pragmatic transfer in interlanguage pragmatics.

The prime objective of this study is to explore the role of pragmatic transfer in the accomplishment of particular speech acts among Pashtu and Saraiki language users as learners of English language. Through the analysis of pragmatic transfer and interlanguage analysis, the present study will focus on negative transfer as a sociopragmatic outcome of pragmatic transfer.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Overview of the chapter

This chapter presents a detailed discussion on the methodological aspects of the study. The chapter begins with briefly delineating a theoretical framework for the study which is followed by a brief section on research methods in the field of interlanguage pragmatics. Section 3 provides a detail on the research instruments of the study, viz. written discourse completion tasks, oral role-plays and semi structured interviews. Section 4 provides details on the participants of the study. Section 5 focuses on the details related to the mode of data analysis. The chapter ends with a brief summary.

The primary objective of this study is to investigate the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer among the selected diverse linguistic and cultural background learners in accomplishing the speech acts of apology, refusal and requests. Moreover, it also aims to find out the usage of the strategies of directness and indirectness during the realization of the selected speech acts. Most importantly, the study is designed to investigate the selected English language learners' inclination towards the use of pragmatic transfer if that is used as a resource during the accomplishment of the selected speech acts. The present study further focuses on the factors underlying pragmatic transfer that affect the pragmatic competence of English language learners. The study is based on the following research questions.

1. What specific in/direct discourse strategies the Saraiki and Pashtu English language learners transfer from the mother tongue to the target language (English)?
2. Why do the Saraiki and Pashtu English language learners use pragmatic transfer as a resource for accomplishing different communicative tasks in the target language?
3. How does pragmatic transfer affect the pragmatic competence of the selected English language learners in the target language?

Keeping in view the above research questions, I found Kasper's (1992) framework of pragmatic transfer as the most appropriate to serve as theoretical framework for this study which is still in vogue. Moreover, some postulate of other researchers has been endorsed in order to strengthen the postulates of the selected

theory. It is pertinent to discuss in the next section the above mentioned theoretical framework of the present study that has guided the study.

3.1 Theoretical Framework

Propounded by Kasper (1992), this study is grounded in the theoretical framework of pragmatic transfer which focuses on the need for developing such strategies that create an ease or facilitate the learners in the process of learning L2 production and comprehension via mother tongue. Moreover, the notion of pragmatic transfer falls in the domain of ILP, and the designated framework for this study has been taken from Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993) who recognized five research areas in ILP. The first area deals with the learning of pragmatic knowledge which focuses on the understanding of the pragmatic means and conventions. Secondly, the production of linguistic action which is carried out through adopting certain strategies, direct or indirect to accomplish a communicative act while transferring from mother tongue to the target language. Third is the area which focuses on the development of pragmatic competence which illustrates the ability of the speakers where learners from diverse linguistic backgrounds achieve certain level of pragmatic competence in the target language. Most importantly, the fourth area of ILP research is the pragmatic transfer that demonstrates the incorporation of mother tongue resources into L2. Moreover, it focuses on language users' performance of communicative acts in L2 and their interpretation is often attributed to pragmatic transfer. Furthermore, transfer resulting in IL outcomes which is considered to be compatible with L2 patterns (positive transfer) is the focus in pragmatics. Yet, as an underlying influence of learners' pragmatic behavior of L1, it calls for further justification. Lastly, the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer not only creates an ease for learners in the learning of L2, but also focuses on the communicative outcomes of such strategies during L2 production.

Among these identified areas of research in ILP, the present study is specifically designed to explore the strategies of directness and indirectness transferred by the learners from their L1 to L2 during their production of L2, and to what extent this transfer affects the pragmatic competence of the ESL learners. Similarly, Kasper (1992) pointed out that non- native speakers differ in many respects from native speakers in the performance of several communicative acts. Based on Kasper's notion of pragmatic transfer, this study assumes a strong role of pragmatic

transfer in the second language learning. In the recent past, a little attention has been paid to the theoretical and methodological debate regarding transfer in the field of interlanguage pragmatics.

The present study also acknowledges the postulates lay down by Chen and Li (2016) who mainly focus on the transfer effects of mother tongue on the learning of L2 of Chinese English learners. They noted that the transfer of Chinese in English can be both positive and negative. The transfer of Chinese can also play a positive role in English writings. However, compared with negative transfer, the positive effect of Chinese is not so obvious. The study is also guided by the theoretical considerations on pragmatic transfer by Qu and Wang (2005) who have shown supportive findings in their research. The result reveals that the students with lower English proficiency make more pragmalinguistic transfer than the students with a relatively higher English proficiency. As the learners improve their English proficiency, they make negative pragmatic transfer but the pragmalinguistic errors are significantly reduced. Instead, they make more sociopragmatic transfers (Qu & Wang, 2005, p. 72).

In short, the present study employs the framework of pragmatic transfer, which falls in the domain of ILP. A worth-emphasizing point is that pragmatic transfer either creates an ease or hampers the ability of the learners in the learning process of L2. Thus, the study delineates to those aspects of the selected framework that focus on the pragmatic comprehension and production whereby deterrence is posed by the mother tongue cultural traits. However, the framework informs the present study to investigate the cultural norms of learners that affect the pragmatic competence of the learners. Following pragmatic transfer as a theoretical framework, it is important to present the research setting of the current study.

3.2 Research Setting

The study has been conducted in the Department of English Language and Literature, Gomal University, D.I.Khan. Owing to its highly multicultural setting, this university provides a very apt context for this study which concerns itself with the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of the students. The university is situated in an area where students from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds of this province come to pursue their education. Due to its geographical location, the students are observed using regional languages such as: Pashtu and Saraiki along with national language in their learning process during the entire stay for the academic years on

campus. It is essential here to mention the disciplines offered by the department, which was established in 1989 focusing initially on English literature. The department offers two major disciplines, i.e., BA Honors (4-year programme) which is semester system for the duration of 4 years, and MA (English) which is also semester system for the duration of 2 academic years. The researcher main focus lies on the realization of the selected speech acts and the data related will be obtained from the participants in the above-mentioned academic setting. The researcher himself has a broad understanding of Saraiki language which is not his mother tongue but is able to use it proficiently for communicative purposes. At present, the researcher is serving as a teacher in the said university for the last fourteen years and is very much familiar to the traditions, language practices and cultural norms of this area. For the current study, the research methods available for investigating the realization of speech acts in ILP broadly fall in the area of Applied Linguistics and that is why an overview of research methods in the field has been presented below.

3.3 Research Methods in Interlanguage Pragmatics

This research is inspired from and has been designed within research methods of ILP by using written DCTs, oral open role plays and is strengthened further with semi-structured interviews. Using three data collection tools, the research truly promises data triangulation, and the selected tools also serve to make this study qualitative cum quantitative in nature. The selection of appropriate method in research is a fundamental stage to initiate the process. Upon the qualitative research paradigm, Given (2008) stated that these are ‘words’ which make the qualitative data. By adopting this qualitative and quantitative approach, the researcher found a chance for gaining an open access to collect rich data in the field and also to probe into the matter with an in-depth study through thick description (Kardorff & Steinke, 2004). Moreover, it was ensured with a serious concern to find out the true aspects of pragmatic transfer, and a particular focus was maintained on the strategies employed by Pashtu and Saraiki speakers learning English as a target language. Thus, the collected data has been analyzed in the form of descriptive statistics and qualitative interpretations and descriptions with the help of developing thematic categories for analysis.

To collect appropriate data is a critical issue in the field of pragmatic research because it depends on the data collection tools that truly define whether the collected

data is consistent and reliable to embody the accurate performance of linguistic action. Among the data collection instruments, a major one in pragmatic research is the DCT, that is, however, questioned for its reliability. In this connection, Kasper and Dahl (1991) emphasize on the scope of DCTs along with role plays that are used as the foremost data collection tools in ILP. The instrument of DCT has been defined by Levenston and Blum-Kulka (1983) as a written or oral questionnaire that consists of short details of a specific situation developed to explore the design of a speech act being studied.

However, using DCTs, the researchers lose control on the interaction or on how diverse variables affect participants' attitude in conversation; other available data collection tools include prompted conversation and role-plays. Using these tools, verbal data can be attained under controlled settings, since the researchers can regulate the situation of the interaction and overcome the variables superseded in it. Therefore, DCTs are used to gather data on pragmatic transfer in the production of speech acts and to investigate the learners' understanding of speech act realization strategies. Finally, interviews, diaries and think-aloud activities have been suggested in order to gather data on learners' cognitive practices concerning their pragmatic performance. Among the prevailing data collection methods in pragmatics, the most extensively recognized methods have been the role-plays and the DCTs. According to Félix-Brasdefer (2010), using these two data collection tools, different variables, such as situation, politeness factors, gender, age of the participants and their proficiency levels, can be easily taken into account.

3.4 Mixed-Methods Research Paradigm

Before describing how and why the researcher placed this research in the mixed-methods tradition, it is essential here to discuss the importance of the two philosophies: Qualitative and Quantitative in relation with EFL/ESL classroom. Moreover, the selection of the appropriate methods is very significant and crucial in a research plan. Duff (2002, p. 14) also indicates the problems related to the choice of the methods of research in the field of Applied Linguistics and asserts this fact in the following words:

The approach or method is crucially linked to the research question or problem under investigation, the purpose of the study (e.g.,

exploratory, interpretive, descriptive, explanatory, confirmatory, predictive) and the type of data and population one is working with.

Quantitative approach includes a variety of approaches, designs, and tools such as correlation, surveys, and multifactor studies, in addition to experimental or quasi-experimental studies. Moreover, Qualitative research encompasses a broad, expanding assortment of approaches, including narrative research, life history, autobiographical or biographical accounts, content analysis, historical and archival studies, conversation analysis, micro ethnography, and discourse analysis. From the start of the study, it was in the mind of the researcher that the selection of appropriate and relevant research designs helps to answer properly the research problems. For that purpose, the methods used in this study are in accordance with the research questions and resources at hand.

Researchers benefit from being familiar with the numerous classifications of mixed methods designs. These classifications represent different disciplines, and they use different terminology. Researchers should be aware of the range of mixed methods design types, as well as the discipline-based discussions of mixed methods designs. In this vein, Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003b) observed nearly 40 different types of mixed method designs. Similarly, Creswell, et al. (2003) have summarized the range of these classifications. The different types and various classifications speak to the evolving nature of mixed methods research. It is easy to get lost in the details, as these classifications are drawn from different disciplines, have emphasized different facets of mixed methods designs, and lack consistency in the names of the designs. It may even appear that little agreement exists among these authors and that there are an infinite number of design options. The four major types of mixed method designs are the Triangulation Design, the Embedded Design, the Explanatory Design, and the Exploratory Design. The present study employs the triangulation design of mixed methods which is further embedded into the convergence model.

The most common and well-known approach to mixing methods is the Triangulation Design (Creswell, et al., 2003). The purpose of this design is “to obtain different but complementary data on the same topic” (Morse, 1991, p. 122) to best understand the research problem. The intent in using this design is to bring together the differing strengths and non overlapping weaknesses of quantitative methods (large sample size, trends, generalization) with those of qualitative methods (small N, details, in depth) (Patton, 1990). This design and its underlying purpose of converging

different methods have been discussed extensively in the literature (e.g., Jick, 1979; Brewer & Hunter, 1989; Greene et al., 1989; Morse, 1991). This design is used when a researcher wants to directly compare and contrast quantitative statistical results with qualitative findings or to validate or expand quantitative results with qualitative data.

The Triangulation Design is a one-phase design in which researchers implement the quantitative and qualitative methods during the same timeframe and with equal weight. The single-phase timing of this design is the reason it has also been referred to as the “concurrent triangulation design” (Creswell, et al., 2003, p. 14). It generally involves the concurrent, but separate, collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data so that the researcher may best understand the research problem. The researcher attempts to merge the two data sets, typically by bringing the separate results together in the interpretation or by transforming data to facilitate integrating the two data types during the analysis. Jenkins’ (2001) single-phase study of rural adolescent perceptions of alcohol and another drug resistance is an example of a Triangulation Design. She collected and analyzed quantitative and qualitative data and merged the two data sets into one overall interpretation in which she related the quantitative results to the qualitative findings.

The four variants are the convergence model, the data transformation model, the validating quantitative data model, and the multilevel model. The first two models differ in terms of how the researcher attempts to merge the two data types (either during interpretation or during analysis), the third model is used to enhance findings from a survey, and the fourth is used to investigate different levels of analysis. The convergence model represents the traditional model of a mixed methods triangulation design (Creswell, 1999). In this model, the researcher collects and analyzes quantitative and qualitative data separately on the same phenomenon and then the different results are converged (by comparing and contrasting the different results) during the interpretation. Researchers use this model when they want to compare results or to validate, confirm, or corroborate quantitative results with qualitative findings.

3.5 Rationale for the Selection of Research Instruments

As researchers need to gather qualitative data, they use various methods and do not rely on a single method (Gay and Mills, 2008). Most important to mention here is that this batch consisted of 60 students, which was divided into two sections (A and

B) with equal number of students (30+30). The tool of DCTs was administered with section A, and the data through oral role plays was collected from the students of section B in order to validate the results. The researcher has only collected data from BA (Hons, 4 years) students enrolled in the first semester of the program.

So, the use of multiple methods is always helpful to judge the opinion of the participants along with that of the researcher. The present study is designed with the logic of data triangulation by adopting three major data collection tools related to research methods in ILP, comprised of written DCTs, oral open role plays and semi-structured interviews.

3.5.1 Discourse Completion Tasks (DCTs)

DCTs as a data collection instrument have gained much reputation during the last decades of 21st century, and have also been used as elicitation format in cross-cultural and IL pragmatics. Levenston and Blum-Kulka (1983) extended the notion to the study of lexical simplification, and were the first to acknowledge DCTs as a foremost data collection tool for exploring speech act realization. According to the definition, DCTs (either written or oral) consist of questionnaires with a brief description about the situation where one has to perform a particular linguistic act, followed by an empty slot for the speech act under study. The participants are asked to fill in a response in the given slot. A series of studies conducted in the past is based on DCTs, for instance, the one conducted in the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (henceforth, CCSARP) proposed by Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper, (1989) and Blum-Kulka and Olshtain, (1984). For the current study, written DCTs were selected after piloting the research tools. Among the situations of DCTs, some were adapted from the studies conducted by King and Silver (1993), Al-Issa (2003), Nguyen (2006) and Duan (2008) (See Appendix A& B for situations).

For this study, DCTs consisted of a written account of a situation in the form of a short dialogue with an empty space which was meant to be filled in by the participants of the study. The context was specified in the given situation and formatted in such a manner that the precise pragmatic aspect under study could be motivated. Moreover, three situations were developed for each speech act in which the status and social distance varies. However, as distinguished by Roever (2005) who stated that DCTs can be controlled more precisely than other data collection tools, but it does not mean that DCTs are the easiest means of data collection to be utilized. It cannot be overlooked that DCTs afford several important advantages. For example,

DCTs facilitate researchers to gather a bulky amount of data in a reasonably short time. Furthermore, they are likely to generate exemplary responses which are expected to occur in extemporaneous speeches. On the other hand, DCTs also elicit conventional responses which are socially suitable. Beebe and Cummings (1996) maintained that on one hand much consideration has been paid to study the weaknesses of DCTs; on the other hand, the weaknesses of natural data are scarcely debated.

Similarly, DCTs facilitate the researchers in comprehending the production of a speech act in a reliable way. In this regard, Kwon (2004) specifies that DCT is an operative data collection instrument when the primary objective of the inquiry is,

to inform the speakers' pragmalinguistic knowledge of the strategies and linguistic forms by which communicative acts can be implemented, and about their sociopragmatic knowledge of the context factors under which particular strategies and linguistic choices are appropriate (p. 342).

Bearing in mind the advantages and the disadvantages of the DCTs, it was important to take into consideration the scheme of DCTs so that the advantages of the method could be utilized. Extending this idea, Billmyer and Varghese (2000) forwarded a suggestion about the idea of restructuring the instrument of DCTs; it was believed that by redesigning DCT, its appropriateness could be improved for the elicitation of the reliable discourse in real life situations.

3.5.2 Oral Open Role-Plays

The research instrument of role-play has been employed as a kind of instrument that offers learners a comprehensive description of a situation that is essential to be performed. For the current study, the same nine situations were repeated in this tool and recorded the oral responses of the participants. Moreover, it is a reproduction of communicative encounter "that elicits spoken data in which two interlocutors assume roles under predefined experimental conditions" (Felix-Brasdefer, 2010, p. 47). Contingent on the scope of the interaction, a difference has been pointed out between closed and open role-plays by Roever and Kasper (2005). According to them, closed role-play encompasses single informer turn in response to the portrayal of a situation that includes definite guidelines. In contrast to this kind, learners involved in open role plays are offered with the situation and requested to perform it without providing any further strategies. Likewise, open role-plays may

include as many turns and discourse segments as the participants need to sustain their interaction. By doing so, different roles may provide an opportunity for researchers to observe the sociopragmatic features of power, distance and degree of imposition (Brown & Levinson, 1987). These factors may influence the participants' choice of specific pragmalinguistics forms to perform the communicative act involved in the role-play enactment.

Beside all these positive features, specifically those of demonstrating oral production, functioning of the turn-taking and their prospects for interaction/negotiation, the employment of role-plays as a tool for collecting learners' oral production data also requires certain limitations. As pointed out by Golato (2003) that the roles participants assume seem either fabricated or imaginary, and this may exert an influence on their production when asked to perform the roles which they might have never performed in real life. Furthermore, this author remarks that the participants know the fact behind the accomplishment of role-plays, and might not entail any pragmatic concerns in comparison to what really occurs in authentic conversations. In the wake of this view, the focus is not only on what is linguistically said in the role-plays but also on how it is pragmatically said might not be reflected in real speech situations.

To sum up, Kasper (1993) illustrated that role plays provide considerably reliable data and have been proven as rich data source in comparison to Discourse Completion data. Role plays characterize oral production, full operation of the turn-taking format, unplanned decisions depending on interlocutor input, including negotiation of meaning (in the SLA sense of the term), when required. The most striking feature of open role plays for the current study in IL pragmatics is that they allow to closely examine how speech act performance is successively structured (e.g., in terms of strategy choice and politeness venture), what categories of interlocutor responses are provoked by particular strategic choices, and how these responses in turn define the speaker's next intended move are the main foci of this study.

3.5.3 Semi Structured Interviews

Semi means, 'a part' and structured means, 'part in name'. Such interviews are preferred in Applied Linguistics as they have an open-ended format in which participants are always encouraged to provide detailed information in exploratory manner. This type of interview is suitable in situations where a researcher has enough command on the phenomenon and he is able to raise many questions and lets the

respondent come up with a thorough response. Interviews are specifically used as a tool and are considered an easy and appropriate way to gain access to particular knowledge about an individual on a particular phenomenon. In this regard, a set of 15 questions was formed on the three selected speech acts. The researcher also conducted face to face semi-structured interviews with his eight participants. Whyte (2001) calls such interviews, 'flexibly structured' which are structured only in the mind of the researcher as they facilitate the researcher to get a true perspective on a certain phenomenon. In this vein, Spradely (1979) refers to the ethnographic interview approach as 'friendly conversation'. It also contributes in establishing a friendly environment between the interviewer and the interviewee.

3.6 Variables of the Study

There are several variables which are not considered necessary because they were beyond the scope of the study. However, the present study deals with the following variables:

The independent variable of the present study is the linguistic and cultural background of the participants on which they differ. The dependent variables are the social distance with the interlocutor and the situational context which may affect the performance of the participants. Keeping the dependent variable in view, the situations were designed in different settings and with interlocutors holding different statuses in order to gauge the performance of the participants in the accomplishment of the selected speech acts. In the same vein, La Castro (2012) demonstrates that actions such as requesting someone to close the door or ordering coffee at a coffee shop are thoroughly related to the social context of a speaker's environment. Similarly, the strategies followed by people for using a language vary accordingly from culture to culture, but not knowing about the prevailing cultural norms might diminish the effectiveness of communication.

Besides, language is fluid not static, and variations take place on the individual level first, grounded in sub-groups or particular speech communities which gradually progress into changes at the societal level (Gay & Mills, 2008). Likewise, native and non-native English speakers encode and decode messages in different ways because of their diverse cultural backgrounds. On the other hand, native English speakers have a tendency to celebrate the idea that the English language and culture are all-pervading and understood across the world. Following the model of pragmatic failure

presented by Thomas (1983) who extended the idea that cross-cultural communication involves a piece of information transmitted between two or more interlocutors who may not share a common cultural or linguistic background. Socio-pragmatic discrepancies occur in different cultures, violating different pragmatic ‘ground rules’ when these are summoned.

To sum up, there might be cultural, personal, and contextual essentials that leave an impact on the judgment to apologize, and affect the choice of the strategy. Culturally, for example, getting late in attending a meeting might be alleged as a more severe offence in an American setting than in a Pakistani one, and therefore Americans, as a group, will have a propensity to apologize more sincerely in this situation. At individual level, some people are inclined to apologize more than others do. On the contextual level, the physical background may be such that an offence can be alleged as more or less threatening. For example, bouncing into someone in a jam-packed bus might be viewed as a considerably lesser offence than bouncing into someone in an open area. Therefore, social restrictions of distance, power, and age might also contribute, within a cultural setting, to enhance an apology. In some cultures, the urge and orientation to make an apology to an older person or to a superior may be more noticeable than in some other cultures.

3.7 Data Analysis

To analyze the data related to pragmatic transfer in terms of research is often a difficult and strenuous process. Some scholars, especially those working in the generative framework, have concentrated entirely on acceptability, judgment or comprehension tasks, as these should better reproduce the core linguistic competence without invoking the perplexing elements associated with live performance. Moreover, the leading sources of data among other approaches are production data and more explicitly those coming from communicative oral tasks. The inclination for oral data has been driven by their being more unstructured, unplanned, and thus based on imbedded linguistic knowledge of L1. Therefore, oral data is meant to be transcribed, which is a very laborious activity. For an average transcription, almost 10 hours are required to be consumed for one hour of data, and the amount of time will increase in terms of more accurate transcriptions, e.g., including phonological, prosodic or gestural information. Later on, the transcribed data is usually exposed to

some type of coding in which all occurrences of the phenomenon under investigation are marked, counted and categorized.

3.7.1 Analysis of Written Discourse Completion Tasks (WDCTs)

A written DCT consisting of nine different situations was distributed among 50 participants. The prompts found in their written discourses were later transcribed that's why analysis of the data produced by written responses to the discourse completion tasks was put to an autonomous assessment of each response rendering to a number of proportions. These proportions have been used through operational definitions of the claims of the selected analytical framework, offered in the form of a coding scheme. The pattern encompasses three main fragments— one each for apologies, requests and refusals, three situations were developed for each of the selected speech act for analysis.

Cohen et al. (1983) have classified apologies in different categories and the current study has used it as an analytical framework. The raw data were analyzed and categorized according to the semantic formulas used in each response. The classifications are as follows:

A. Five apology strategies:

- a. direct apology (IFIDs): “sorry,” “excuse,” “forgive,” etc.
- b. explanation: nonspecific (There has been a lot going on in my life), and specific (I could not catch the bus.)
- c. responsibility: implicit (I was sure I did it right.), lack of intent (I did not mean to.), self deficiency (How could I be so blind.), and self-blame (It is my fault.)
- d. repair: unspecified (How can I fix that?), and specified (Let me buy a new computer for you.)
- e. promise of forbearance: such as, “It won’t happen again.”

B. Combination or absence of apology strategies:

- a. combination of the strategies
- b. absence of the strategies

C. Modification of apology strategies:

- a. intensity of apology: “really,” “very,” “terribly,” etc.
- b. minimizing responsibility: “I told you not to do that.”
- c. denial of responsibility: denial of fault (It is not my fault.), and blaming the hearer (It is your fault.)

- d. emotionals: interjection (Oh, oops), invocation (God!), or curse (Damn)
- e. minimizing the offense: (No harm done.).
- f. comments: about self, about others, and about the situation.

Adapted from Cohen et. al (1986).

Furthermore, the selected speech acts were coded according to each situation, and the percentage of occurrence of a strategy was calculated according to the number of participants who have used the strategy. Among these, some of the content such as modification of strategies, non-apologies or unusual occurrence of a strategy was further examined and illustrated to be able to understand the nature of the selected speech acts in a better manner. The DCT questionnaires portraying natural situations were designed to elicit from the participants a particular speech act pattern. For the current study, WDCTs comprised of nine situations developed for three speech acts, viz. apology, request and refusal (See Appendix A, B, C), addressing the three possible status relations between speaker and addressee (speaker is lower, equal or higher in status). To analyze the data gathered from the students and the native speakers of English, the particular coding scheme, Cross Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) was used. This coding scheme is a universally valid scale of directness previously empirically tested and successfully used by researchers (Lwanga-Lumu, 2002; Wouk, 2006). The CCSARP schematized requesting strategies in three categories: directness level, internal modification, and external modification. The focus of this study was on directness level of requesting strategies which was classified as a nine-point scale: Mood-derivable performative, Hedged performative, Obligation statement, Want statement, Suggestory formulae, Query preparatory, Strong hints, and Mild hints. Data was analysed adapting the scheme suggested by Blum-Kulka et al., (1990). The articulated speech acts of apology, request and refusal were categorized accordingly into direct and indirect strategies. A speech act is defined as direct if its Head Act is well-matched with one of the direct strategies on the scale, and indirect, if its Head Act resembled with one of the indirect strategies on the scale.

3.7.2 Analysis of Oral Role Plays

For the current study, the same nine situations of WDCTs were repeated in the form of oral role plays with a different group of participants in which oral responses were recorded and later transcribed. The recordings were coded into different

strategies according to the categorization (i.e., direct/indirect refusals and adjuncts to refusals) proposed by Beebe et al. (1990) (see Appendix B). An example is provided below. The sequence of refusal interactions was examined according to the different functions of strategies (Felix-Brasdefer, 2004): (1) pre-refusals: strategies that initiate the refusal negotiation and prepare the addressee for forthcoming refusal (e.g., that sounds fun); (2) head acts: the minimal unit to realize refusals (e.g., I'm busy, I can't come); (3) post-refusals: strategies that follow the head act, emphasizing, justifying, mitigating, or concluding the refusal response (e.g., I'm sorry, thank you for the invitation). If a direct strategy (e.g., no, I can't) of a refusal was present, it was coded as the head act; otherwise, the first indirect strategy (e.g., reason/explanation, regret, repetition) in the sequence was coded as the head act of the refusal. To analyze the data gathered from the students and the native speakers of English, the particular coding scheme, Cross Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) was used. This coding scheme is a universally valid scale of directness previously empirically tested and successfully used by researchers (Lwanga-Lumu, 2002; Wouk, 2006). The CCSARP schematized requesting strategies in three categories: directness level, internal modification, and external modification. The focus of this study was on directness level of requesting strategies which was classified as a nine-point scale: Mood derivable, Performative, Hedged performative, Obligation statement, Want statement, Suggestory formulae, Query preparatory, Strong hints, and Mild hints.

The strategies used before or after the refusal head act were coded as pre- or post-refusals. In addition, each refusal interaction consisted of two episodes: first, refusal in response to the initiating act by the researcher (i.e., invitation), followed by negotiation of the refusal in response to insistence by the researcher. After the researcher analyzed the data, descriptive statistics were used by calculating the frequency and percentage of strategy use, refusal sequence and content of explanations. Different categorizations of strategies have been recommended (e.g., Rubin, 1983; Beebe et al., 1990; Turnbull & Saxton, 1997), among them the most significant and well-known is the one recommended by Beebe, Takahashi and Uliss-Weltz (1990). Their classification is based on semantic formulas of being direct or indirect (i.e., those expressions used to perform a refusal) and adjuncts (i.e., those terminologies which attend to a refusal but which cannot by themselves be used to accomplish a refusal). Based on this classification, Salazar et al. (2009) presented their taxonomy for the analysis of the learners' making a refusal by approving a

conversational perspective. Most importantly, the semantic formulas are divided into direct and indirect strategies where direct strategies include two main subtypes: i) bluntness, which requires the use of a “no” or the use of a performative verb, and ii) negation of proposition, which encompasses expressions that comprehend negations.

On the other hand, indirect strategies are divided into seven main subtypes: i) plain indirect, which indicate those expressions that alleviate the refusal; ii) reason or explanation, in which the refuser mentions the reason why he/she is unable to comply with the request; iii) regret or apology, in which the refuser feels an offence for rejecting the request; iv) alternative, which includes a selection of choice; v) disagreement/dissuasion/criticism, in which the refuser sternly disagrees with the action of asking or dissuades the requester from asking; vi) statement of principle/philosophy, in which the refuser uses indicators of moral beliefs to avoid the execution of the request; and vii) avoidance, which contains non-verbal avoidance, in which the refuser simply overlooks the request by maintenance of silence and verbal avoidance, in which the refusal is transmitted by using hedges to change the topic.

Beebe, et al. (1990) classifies refusals into two categories, direct and indirect refusals: I. Direct: 1. Using performative verbs, 2. Non-performative statement. II. Indirect: 1. Statement of regret 2. Wish 3. Excuse, reason, explanation 4. Statement of alternative 5. Set condition for future or past acceptance 6. Promise of future acceptance 7. Statement of principle 8. Statement of philosophy 9. Attempt to dissuade interlocutor 10. Acceptance that functions as a refusal 11. Avoidance 12. Statement of positive opinion 13. Statement of empathy 14. Pause fillers 15. Gratitude/appreciation.

(Adapted from Beebe, et. al. 1990).

3.7.3 Analysis of Semi-structured Interviews

The verbal data obtained through semi-structured interviews was analysed through the mode of Content Analysis as proposed by (Krippendorf, 2003; Weber, 1990). This method of analysis permits the researchers to analyze comparatively form less data and has been used as a significant mode of analysis in second language research studies involving verbal reports (Olk, 2002). A crucial component of this procedure is the process of data reduction where ‘many words of texts are classified into much fewer content categories’ (Weber, 1990, p. 15). The initial phase of content analytic process is the dissection of text for the analysis and identification of sense units (Krippendorf, 2003). Babbie (2001) elaborated further that content analysis

focuses on "the study of recorded human communications" (p.304). It is "essentially a coding operation," with coding being "the process of transforming raw data into a standardized form" (p.309). In fact, Ryan and Bernard (2000) see content analysis as one of the "major coding traditions" (p.780). The researcher set a few objectives in his mind with certain themes (Taylor & Renner, 2003).

Content analysis was further supplemented by thematic analysis in the present study. In the semi-structured interviews, some kind of control over the questions was observed but the interviewees were at liberty to answer the asked questions. Consequently, the participants of the study spoke with full freedom in expressing their opinions and beliefs. The digitally recorded interviews were transcribed, coded, and then categories were developed from the emerged themes of these interviews. These categories helped the researcher to generate themes, which ensured facilitation during data analysis, and then conclusions were drawn on the basis of these developed themes.

3.8 Sample of the Study

To define truly the selection of an appropriate sample is a laborious job in mixed-methods research paradigm in contrast to other types of research sampling which usually has an established strategy. On the other hand, mixed-methods research paradigm and particularly research in interlanguage pragmatics favours purposive sampling. Upon the definition, Kaplan and Maxwell (2005) declare purposive sampling as 'purposeful selection' (p.88) which is also known as a procedural selection. The selection of a sample through this criterion helps the researcher to adopt a procedure as to who would fit or become a participant of the study. The answer is the one who can deliver enough information. The researcher used purposive sampling as the research setting was quite conducive for the execution of the present study. The data was collected from fifty undergraduate students who were selected purposively through discourse completion tasks, twelve students were selected for open role plays, and eight students participated in semi-structured interviews. The researcher is very thankful and indebted to the participants for their active participation in the process of data collection. The data was rich enough to meet the demands of research objectives and research questions. Below, a detailed note is provided about the selected participants who were selected purposively.

3.8.1 Participants of the Study

There is no clear evidence or hard rule to the sample size in qualitative research paradigm. The participants of the study were the students at the Department of English Language and Literature, enrolled in their BS (Hons) 4-years programme, belonging to either Pashtu or Saraiki linguistic background. At the time of data collection, they were passing through 2nd year of the programme. The researcher's sample for the present study comprised of 50 students of BS (Hons. 4-years). For written DCTs, 30 participants were selected from the two different linguistic backgrounds with equal number (15+15). After this, 12 participants participated in oral open role plays with equal number (6+6). Out of these, eight participants (4+4) were further selected for semi-structured interviews in order to get a holistic view of the participants about the topic of the study. The researcher's selection of 50 participants for the study was done purposively. They belonged to either Pashtu or Saraiki linguistic background their ages ranged from 19 to 21 years, comprised of both males and females.

3.8.2 Time Duration of the Study

For the purpose of data collection, 30 participants were requested to fill in the written DCTs along with demographic profile sheet. WDCTs took 3-5 weeks in completion. For oral role plays, 12 participants were selected and they were requested to act out the assigned roles in different situations which were audio recorded and transcribed later. Total recording of role plays comprised of 190 minutes in which every participant had almost taken the time duration of 15-25 minutes each in making responses. Furthermore, the researcher developed a set of questions ranging from 7 to 10 in number for the semi structured interviews as to ascertain data triangulation, and to gauge the congeniality of the study. They were recorded for the duration of 180 minutes in eight interview sessions in which every participant had almost taken the time duration of 20-25 minutes. Throughout the entire process, the researcher remained a non-participant.

3.9 Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted to ascertain the authenticity of different data collection modes. Mainly, piloting was done to validate whether oral or written DCTs and open role plays would be appropriate sources of data elicitation or this study. Moreover, the researcher examined the difficulty level of the written DCTs and open

role plays in terms of language, instructions and content. This pilot study resulted in numerous changes which were incorporated in the final draft after deliberating them with the supervisor. The following changes were made in the process:

- i. The written mode of DCTs was preferred over the oral DCTs because richer data was obtained through written DCTs.
- ii. Instructions and language were made clearer in some situations to make them more understandable to the participants.
- iii. The researcher ensured his presence to answer the queries associated with the situations given in the written DCTs.

3.10 Ethical Considerations

The researcher himself has been serving in the institution for the last fourteen years but keeping the research ethics in mind, before collecting the data from the participants, a formal permission was obtained from the Head of the Department. The researcher during the entire process of data collection has neither threatened nor imposed any activities on the participants meant to be accomplished, nor kept them confined to any setting that was not encouraging. Keeping into consideration the research ethics, the researcher informed them in the beginning about the purpose of the study, and also obtained approval from them, and the researcher never observed them being intimidated due to his presence. Besides, getting formal permission from the Head, the researcher obtained a consent duly signed by the participants who participated in the entire process of data collection. Their identity was kept confidential and pseudonyms were used wherever necessary. The participants' responses in oral role plays and interview sessions were audio recorded after their approval for the recording process and they were ensured about the confidentiality of the recording.

The next section discusses the transcription conventions which are adapted from Jefferson (2009).

3.11 Transcription Conventions

Soon after passing through these stages of collecting data, WDCTs filled in and role plays and interviews audio recorded; transcription of the recorded data was done with the help of my colleagues at the department only for Saraiki language because the correct Roman version of other vernaculars was intensely required for this study to avoid any mistakes in transcription. The researcher also translated into

English the utterances which were in Pashtu, Saraiki or Urdu for the analysis by following Hollway and Jefferson (2008) transcription notations. Pursuing the concept of transcription, Eisner (1992) points out the critical role of note-taking and audio-recording in qualitative research as they definitely provide a close feedback in the form of reminders for description and analysis. The researcher also faced difficulty on several occasions where the voice of the participant was almost inaudible. In order to overcome this problem, a strategy of listening repeatedly the audio recorded material was adopted to understand the real utterance of the participant. It also happened in classroom recording that due to hot weather of the area, sound produced by fans could often be heard which created distraction. However, the researcher overcame these difficulties through repeated consultation with other colleagues and his supervisor. It is necessary here to provide a brief account of the reasons behind the selected speech acts under study, and how these speech acts influence the identity of the selected participants has also been discussed below.

3.12 Rationale for the Selection of Speech Acts

Ogiermann (2009) demonstrated that speakers accomplish the speech act of apology with an objective in their mind, that is, to mitigate the effect of intentional/unintentional mistakes that may decrease the force of committed offence. Speaker apologizing for refusals identifies that violation of a social practice occurs, and acknowledges the fact that the speaker is at least somewhat and somehow involved in its origin. Hence, by its nature, apologies entail loss of face at the end of the speaker and sustenance for the hearer. By accomplishing an act of apology, the speaker adheres to the sustenance of social norms, and makes an effort to appease the hearer. Moreover, the accomplishment of the speech act of apology also varies keeping the speaker's context into view, and also depends on the status of the interlocutors.

Regarding request as a speech act, Brown and Levinson (1978) demonstrate that the production of a request is by definition a face-threatening act, and the speaker intrudes at the hearer's assertion to the independence of action, and independence from imposition. Furthermore, the diversity of direct and indirect ways for forwarding a request are available at hand to speakers in all languages across the world which is socially inspired by the need to lessen the imposition duly tangled in the act itself. Alternatively, the speaker can curtail the imposition by choosing an indirect strategy

to a direct one, i.e., by stimulating choice on the scale of indirectness. Following Faerch and Kasper (1984) who established that if a speaker has decided on the level of directness for performing an act while forwarding a request, still the speaker has a variety of choices in the form of verbal means available through which the extent of imposition involved can be easily manipulated. In Austin's (1975) and Searle's (1976) taxonomies of speech acts, requests are included under the heading of 'directives'. It is a pre-event statement that is accomplished to influence the hearer's sequence of action that impels the speaker to execute an act for the advantage of one or both parties. Searle (1969) has sharply noted that a request is: "a future act A of H, which is considered as an attempt to get H to do an act which S wants H to do, and which S believes that H is able to do, and which it is not obvious that H will do in the normal course of events or of H's own accord" (p. 66). Likewise, it is asserted that speakers do accomplish a speech act considering the illocutionary force in order to maximize the size of softness in the speech act of request.

Furthermore, Beebe, et al. (1990) classified refusals into two categories, direct and indirect refusals. Granting an approval or showing a disagreement is usually chosen in response to these speech acts, such as saying "no" can mean displeasure of the interlocutor's intents and accordingly, an intimidation to the interlocutor's face. Therefore, as Chen (1995, p. 6) points out, "refusals are considered to be a face threatening act (FTA) in that either the speaker's or listener's positive or negative face is risked when a refusal is called for or carried out". Owing to the face-threatening nature they require, refusals be apt to be indirect, comprise modification, and/or suspension within the turn or across turns (Houck & Gass, 1999). As a matter of fact, they include an extensive converted order with lots of face-saving schemes to accommodate its dissenting nature (Houck & Gass, 1996), and that is the reason that the speech act of refusing properly needs a high level of pragmatic competence (Chen, 1995).

The above discussion on the three speech acts of apology, request and refusal was generated to highlight their significance in social interactions across cultures. These three speech acts were selected for this study with the view to finding out differences/similarities in terms of pragmatic transfer in their accomplishment by the selected participants from two diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds, that is, Saraiki and Pashtu.

3.13 Summary

This chapter briefly discusses different research methods frequently used in the discipline of interlanguage pragmatics. Moreover, DCTs and open role plays were found to be the best means for collecting data in the field of ILP, to which semi-structured interviews were added as the third data collection tool. The chapter also presents details of the procedure of participants' selection, variables of the study, data analysis, and time duration of the study followed by ethical consideration of this research. Moreover, rationale for the selection of three speech acts have been discussed in detail. In the end, transcription of the recorded data has been discussed. The next chapter discusses the analysis of the data obtained through WDCTs.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS-I

This chapter discusses analysis of the data collected through WDCTs, which comprised of nine different situations, in which three situations were developed for each of the selected speech act, viz. apology, request and refusal. The WDCTs were distributed among 30 participants, 15 participants from Pashtu English Language Learners (henceforth coded as PSELL), and 15 from Saraiki English language learners (henceforth coded as SSELL) participated in the study. This chapter is divided into three sections, the first section presents the analysis of the speech act of apology; the second section presents the analysis of the speech act of request, and the last section present the analysis of the speech act of refusal. The chapter ends with a brief summary of the results obtained from the first data collection tool, i.e., WDCTs.

4.1 Speech Act: Apology

The following section presents the results for situation 1.

Situation 1: A student remains absent, and the said student seeks an apology from the chairperson of the department on account of absence from classes. The table given below presents the results for this situation where in both the groups, the SSELL and PSELL were observed using pragmatic transfer through in/direct strategies during the accomplishment of the speech act of apology.

Note: The italicized text highlights the extracts taken from the data.

Table 4.1 Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 1 for Apology

Types of Apology Strategy	PSELL		SSELL		Contents of Situation
	Pragmatic Transfer	%	Pragmatic transfer	%	
IFID	32	26%	28	19%	A student seeks an apology from chairperson for being absent from classes
Explanation	18	15%	34	23%	
Responsibility	37	31%	26	17%	
Repair	12	10%	31	21%	
Promise of forbearance	21	18%	28	19%	

Likewise, the selected English language learners rely more on cultural resources of their mother tongue through pragmatic transfer that is used as a resource during the accomplishment of different communicative tasks. Moreover, the reliance upon mother tongue shows that the participants select from a variety of available strategies of their respective mother tongues. In this vein, most frequently used strategy of illocutionary force initiative device (henceforth, IFID) shows an influence of L1 in the articulation of apology in the target language. Table 4.1 illustrates the occurrences of pragmatic transfer in percentages, and shows the use of strategy adopted during the accomplishment of apology by the selected L2 learners. The figures shown in the table highlights the frequency of the occurrence of pragmatic transfer.

The most used strategy in the accomplishment of the speech act of apology is IFID. A significant difference in the practice of this strategy shows that linguistic elements of the mother tongue are embedded in the target language. On average, 19% of the SSELL as compared to 26% of the PSELL used IFID. For example, a Pashtu female English language learner stated, *“I’m sorry sir, this won’t happen again”*. She used this strategy in making her apology as the first part of the apology is a direct regret over the committed offence. The last clause of this response shows that the speaker wants to ensure the accomplishment and mitigation of the apology. In this way, *‘This won’t happen again’* shows that the speaker accepts his or her responsibility, and can be taken as repair for the loss. The table shows that the PSELL group relied more on the use of mother tongue pragmatic norms in making an apology in English. To perform the act, several strategies were primarily transferred from mother tongue through pragmatic transfer that was used as a resource to accomplish different communicative tasks in English.

On the other hand, the SSELL group showed lesser use of this strategy where mother tongue strategies were used. The table shows that the SSELL group relied less on the transference of their mother tongue linguistic and cultural resources such as making an expression a Saraiki English language learner states: SSELL2 *“I’m terribly sorry sir. I promise this won’t happen again”*, and another Saraiki English language learner, SSELL 1 stated *“Please accept my profuse apology sir, I was down with fever from three successive days, sir! Owing to this, I couldn’t attend classes [sic]*. In these two examples, it is obvious that repair and promise of forbearance have been frequently used as a strategy by the participants of SSELL group to save face. As a matter of fact, the use of other strategies by SSELL participants shows their reliance

on the use of pragmatic transfer as a resource and, thus, affects their pragmatic competence with positive outcomes. As a part of their culture, the SSELL group members have also used pragmatic transfer to increase the effect and intensity of the accomplished acts. It shows that more explanations are provided for the purpose of lessening the effects of the committed offence. As an established norm of SSELL group's cultural and linguistic background, the participants remained more indirect which shows that the mistake will not be repeated in future.

Moreover, the data shows that SSELL group participants have used indirect strategies in making an apology of chairperson and remained more polite in their interaction, and accomplished the speech act as face saving act, for example, SSELL2 who demonstrated that *"I am really ashamed of my act. I'm sorry! I was unable to come because I was ill for a couple of days [sic].* In the same way, SSELL 4 stated *"I am really sorry sir. Kindly accept my apology this time, next time I will be careful"*. The terms 'really ashamed', 'really sorry' in the above two extracts taken from SSELL group data showed that IFID is used more with one adverb of quality to strengthen the force of the illocutionary act that urges an immediate remedy for the act performed by the speaker. Thus, it indicates that pragmatic transfer is used as a resource for transferring linguistic and cultural elements of mother tongue that are incorporated into the target language. In the above two examples, the over repetition of making an apology with different expressions shows the pragmatic competence of the SSELL participants.

On the other hand, the PSELL group participants used both in/direct strategies, which showed that the cultural elements borrowed from mother tongue into the target language create an ease, reveal PSELL group participants' priorities for incorporating cultural and linguistic resources of mother tongue into English. For instance, PSELL 6 wrote: *"Assalam-o-Alaikum, (May you be blessed!) I am sorry sir for being absent. I will never repeat this kind of mistake"* wherein paralinguistic notions in the form of Islamic greetings are incorporated into the target language which is a clear manifestation of being more indirect and less straightforward. Similarly, one of the participants from SSELL group from another section of the same class also displayed some pragmalinguistics features as an oral response in role play. There was an exception in this regard with one SSELL participant who stated that, SSELL 7 *"Sorry sir!"* revealed lack of cultural knowledge, and showed his inability to incorporate

mother tongue resources in English as evident in this example. Furthermore, it also showed the participants' inability to express appropriately his or her views in L2.

Thus, it shows that both the PSELL and SSELL group participants have used all strategies equally for accomplishing the speech act of apology that ultimately comprehends the ability of the learners about the norms of other languages which enhances the domain of pragmatic competence across different languages and cultures. Likewise, both the groups have used pragmatic transfer as a resource for accomplishing different tasks though the use of strategy varies. The mother tongue social norms accompanied with the apologies in English show that pragmatic transfer is used as a resource to translate the idea in the target language. A PSELL participant endorsed in these words: *PSELL 13 "Respectable sir, I am so sorry. Will you please forgive me on this act? [sic]"*. As noted earlier that there was a significant difference in the choice of the performative phrase by these groups. Most of the SSELLs preferred, e.g., *SSELL 14 "I am really sorry sir. Kindly accept my apology this time, next time I will be careful"*. While the SSELL group members have mostly used, "I am sorry or "I am deeply sorry", "I am really sorry", "Please pardon me", "I will not repeat it again" as expressions for making an apology, while PSELL have used the expressions such as, "I am extremely sorry", "Please accept my apology" "Will you please accept my apology?" which are very direct, and can be pragmatically interpreted as the occurrence of transfer which happens due to the interference of mother tongue pragmatic norms.

Another obvious difference in the usage of IFID is that SSELL group less used the strategy of direct apology in the beginning whereas the PSELL group used the IFID expressions in the beginning of the apology chunks. The data in this situation suggested that the PSELL group used frequently the strategies to comprehend their pragmatic competence, while SSELL group accessed with a frequency of IFID closer to SSELL. It might be expected that the SSELL group such as, *SSELL 11 "I am sorry sir. I was absent...actually I will not repeat this mistake"* shows that the accomplishment of speech act is overwhelmingly influenced by their culture. Thus, the SSELL group opted for both in/direct strategies as they have made an apology of the professor with an intensity, and keeping the status of the hearer has led them to be more indirect while keeping in view the social distance of the professor such as, *SSELL 9 I am sorry but actually I spent the whole week suffering from fever. Most*

importantly, the usage of providing an explanation for the offense was significant among the participants from the two groups: (PSELL, 15%, SSELL, 23%).

The above extracts show that the PSELL group used both in/direct strategies, in the culture of PSELL group making statements beyond a definite and required amount of talk is granted as an offence, for example, *PSELL 14 Sorry sir*. So, in order to compensate with the situation immediately, the silence which prevails after the accomplishment of apology is perceived as a sign of submissiveness, repentance over the committed offence, and above all a sign of wholeheartedness and sincerity too. Moreover, it shows that PSELL participants don't think it necessary to provide an explanation or to make an excuse rather a direct apology strategy is chosen in terms of offering a repair for the offense as indicated with a frequency of 10%, while the SSELL group showed twice bigger with 21%. This can be interpreted as an outcome of sociopragmatic transfer that occurs in the performance of both groups employed to save their own faces. Most importantly, PSELL group used the strategy of taking the responsibility more than SSELL group (SSELL 17%, and PSELL 31%).

In terms of responsibility, SSELL and PSELL groups marked differences where SSELL group preferred choice of responsibility as a strategy. The SSELL group generally used the expression such as, *"I didn't mean to"*, while the PSELL group used more self-blame like, *"It is my fault that I couldn't sent an application to your office requesting for sick leave"*. On the other hand, in the combination of strategies both SSELL and PSELL shows a very different pattern. For example, SSELL participant chose to use IFID + Explanation (henceforth, EXP) or IFID + Repair (henceforth, REP), whereas PSELL speakers used REP+IFID, and were preferred as PSELL speakers take it as an offence if they come up with the combination of EXP+IFID, and is regarded as face threatening act at the end of the addressee. This kind of pattern has not been shown by PSELL participants. Moreover, PSELL speakers have used by 18% of the indirect apologies without IFID which indicated their submissiveness and sincerity, for example, *PSELL 8 Sorry sir, I might be apologized this time due to my sickness*. It is, thus, evident that when there is a closer relationship with the hearer, PSELL participants have submitted a due apology. As an important note to mention that there is a high-low social distance between the interlocutors. As a part of PSELL culture, seeking an apology of a professor requires a notion of due respect and being polite, and the accomplishment of apology is then assumed a highly culturally based act meant to be accomplished wholeheartedly and

through cultural knowledge. Whereas, the data presented the SSELL group culture that power relationships are regarded as more flexible and can differ. Thus, it was revealed that the offence on the part of hearer can be considered as not severe.

Situation 2: The second situation includes the same social distance and power relationship like situation 1, but degree of committed offence is different. In this situation, a student who arrives half an hour late to the class submits an apology from a professor. Both groups have used different pattern of in/direct strategies.

Table 4.2 Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 2 for Apology

Types of Apology Strategy	PSELL		SSELL		Contents of Situation
	Pragmatic Transfer	%	Pragmatic transfer	%	
IFID	14	13%	19	16%	A student is seeking an apology of a professor for being half an hour late in the class.
Explanation	4	3%	17	14%	
Responsibility	38	36%	31	26%	
Repair	7	6%	16	13%	
Promise of forbearance	43	40%	34	29%	

The inclusive result shows that the act is accomplished as not face threatening nor offensive. Moreover, the participants have employed in/direct discourse strategies that vary, and hence indicate the transference of mother tongue strategies into the target language. This variation in the choice of strategies is a result of an influence of mother tongue linguistic and cultural resources integrated into the target language. This situation is different from the previous one in the sense that learners are required to accomplish such a communicative act which can save the face of the professor as the offence is of greater intensity. Most importantly, pragmatic transfer is used as a resource to accomplish the communicative act. Therefore, using pragmatic transfer as a resource is employed to enhance the pragmatic competence in the target language. The table 4.2 illustrates the results for this situation, and shows the occurrence of pragmatic transfer in percentages through the strategies of directness and indirectness that are transferred from mother tongue into English.

Following the results shown in the above table that are significant in terms of IFID used as a strategy, the SSELL group has employed by 16%, and the PSELL

group has used by 13%. The use of different pattern of strategies answer to research questions that are used by the participants of both the groups wherein linguistic resources of their mother tongue are embedded into English. For example, *SSELL 5 Sir I have a keen interest in academics but I was busy in hospital*. The participants of both the groups were inclined to use in/direct discourse strategies of mother tongue transferred into English. On the other hand, the PSELL group participants remained indirect, but the difference is not wide because PSELL group did the same almost by incorporating linguistic and cultural strategies of their mother tongue such as, *PSELL 12 Sorry sir, I didn't mean to do so but.... I am really sorry for that*. Likewise, the influence of L1 cultural knowledge creates an ease for ELL in achieving a balanced pragmatic competence in the target language. Thus, it was evident that both the SSELL and PSELL groups have used explanations as a strategy by (SSELL 14%, PSELL 13%) during the accomplishment of apology speech act.

As far as the usage of repair for the offence is concerned, both the groups employed the strategy, and used pragmatic transfer as a resource for accomplishing different communicative tasks in the target language carried out under the influence of their mother tongue pragmatic norms. For example, *PSELL 14 It is really my fault and I am sorry sir, I will not do so again and will be in time. I should have submitted an application which I didn't*. Moreover, the SSELL used 13%, like, *SSELL 13 Uhhh...I am sorry sir. I will be careful next time*. The use of an interjection as feeling extremely sorry indicates a regret over the committed act that manifests the cultural norms of saraikispeakers. In first part of above example, the participants adopt a direct strategy which is often repaired in the second clause. It showed that the offence was not bigger the way apology of a professor is being sought. It might be due to the SSELL group cultural background which varies. Only three participants from the PSELL group have used repair by 10% as a strategy to mitigate and enlighten the offence.

The promise of forbearance as a strategy was used by the participants of both the groups, the SSELL 29% showed the lack of intent, and the PSELL by 40% which showed the increasing intensity of making an apology. Overall, the SSELL participants have used indirect strategy before his professor to minimize the responsibility and come up with self-blaming. For example, *SSELL 15 I committed a blunder, oh!* and *SSELL 5 I am really ashamed for being late*. In the analysis of these two examples, it has been shown that self-blaming as a strategy is used to compensate

with the degree of offence. It showed the use of pragmatic transfer in which the participants rely on the available linguistic resources of mother tongue that are embedded in the target language.

The PSELL participants also remained indirect, and interjections are being used to minimize the offence, like *PSELL 6 OOOHOOOOO.... Sorry sir, I am very late but I was in hospital due to some serious health issues*. As this example suggests and one can see the Pashtun culture elements as the participant uses self-blaming as a strategy, and condemns his act with explanation and repair simultaneously to minimize the intensity of the offence. In this situation, though IFID have been frequently employed by both the groups in which SSELL group has attempted to use intensifiers which are equally employed in the case of PSELL group too. In terms of the repair for the offence, SSELL and PSELL participants presented different types of repairs. In this connection, the PSELL group asserted that they would be careful next time. For example, *PSELL 5 I am sorry sir for being late in the class. I know about the rules but I had.... and PSELL 8 I apologize extremely for being too late in the class, I am late because of my medical checkup*, while the SSELL group opted almost a similar way to repair the offence such as, *SSELL 12 I had forgotten today's class timing. Please pardon me sir*. In these examples, it is shown that the PSELL group participants have used more specific strategies than SSELL group because for PSELL group it was not mere an offence but it is perceived as a greater offence in their culture.

According to the data displayed in the above table, it is demonstrated that both the groups have used specific in/direct strategies which are transferred and then relied on the use of those mother tongue pragmatic resources clearly that increase the pragmatic competence of the learners in the target language. However, the use of less specific strategies shows the lack of pragmatic competence of the learners which cannot be transferred from mother tongue to the target language. The participants' reliance on pragmatic transfer as a resource helps them to broaden their pragmatic competence, and thus, develops an understanding about the prevailing social norms of the target language.

Situation 3: In this situation, the relationship and status between the interlocutors is same or equal. A friend is entertaining another friend whom H/she had met after a long time but meanwhile a few drops of tea split over the clothes of another friend. The intensity and potential of the situation differs culturally. In the SSELL group

culture, if something happens out of the way in the circle of friends then it is not viewed as an offence or blunder, whereas in the PSELL group culture such habits are highly criticized that creates an atmosphere of untrustworthiness and insincerity too.

Table 4.3 Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 3 for Apology

Types of Apology Strategy	PSELL		SSELL		Contents of Situation
	Pragmatic Transfer	%	Pragmatic transfer	%	
IFID	5	24%	7	26%	A friend is seeking an apology of another friend on a mishap
Explanation	4	19%	5	24%	
Responsibility	5	24%	2	7%	
Repair	4	19%	8	29%	
Promise of forbearance	3	14%	5	24%	

Like the results of the previous situations, it is shown that both the groups have used specific strategies through pragmatic transfer which are transferred from mother tongue, and are embedded into the target language. Moreover, the selected English language learners (henceforth, ELL) have used pragmatic transfer as a resource while accomplishing different communicative tasks. In this situation, a few drops of tea have split over the clothes of an old friend whom he had met after long time, but this mishap was not intended. The status and power relation of the interlocutors is equal. As a result, pragmatic transfer allows the learners to rely on the linguistic resources of mother tongue in order to achieve a pragmatic competence in the target language, thus, learners might become able to learn the pragmatic norms that are to be displayed in a right way in the target language.

Reliance upon the cultural and social norms of mother tongue indicates that pragmatic transfer occurs, and different strategies are adopted during the accomplishment of speech act of apology. Moreover, it is noted that pragmatic transfer is used to create an ease in the learning process that helps to comprehend the pragmatic norms of the target language. As a result, the occurrence of pragmatic transfer increases the ability of the learners in achieving a higher level of proficiency, and uses the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer as a resource to acquire a balanced level of pragmatic competence in the target language. The results obtained from the

data of this situation shows that both the groups are involved in the use of some specific strategies. The PSELL participants have used both in/direct strategies while the SSELL group has used fewer strategies. These strategies have been transferred directly or indirectly from mother tongue by the participants of both the groups because pragmatic transfer has been utilized as a resource during the accomplishment of the speech act of apology.

Furthermore, it was shown in the results that the usage of IFID is very high. In the SSELL group has used IFID by 26%, for example, *SSELL 8 I am sorry. I am ashamed of my act but it is mistakenly...* whereas the PSELL group has used this strategy by 24% such as, *PSELL 6 Sorry my dear friend... extremely sorry, don't mind it please* as a part of their apologies. Secondly, the SSELL group has also used explanation as a strategy by 24% frequency. The PSELL group has used similar to SSELL by 19% frequency, for example, *SSELL 14 I am really sorry, it is my fault. I don't know how did it happen? Let me get another cup of tea for you [sic]*. Moreover, explanations as asserted are also different even in the two non-native speakers' group as well. The SSELL group has preferred nonspecific explanations, for example, *SSELL 2 Sorry, Dude!* and *SSELL 3 Sorry, I didn't intend to do so [sic]*, and *SSELL 1 I am sorry dear*, on the other hand, the PSELL group has remained indirect about their explanations. Thus, moving between the pragmatics of two languages indicate that ELL rely on the linguistic resources of their mother tongue. It also shows the lack of pragmatic knowledge in the target language rather the participants borrow linguistic elements from mother tongue, and are transferred in the target language that creates an ease in learning the pragmatic norms, and thus increases the pragmatic competence of learners in L2.

In terms of offering a repair for the committed offense, the SSELL group has used by 29% as a strategy such as, *SSELL 12 Sorry my dear, it was unintentional act*, and *SSELL 10 my dear friend, please apologize me*, which have less used by the PSELL participants by 19% frequency, like, *PSELL 8 Don't mind please. I am so sorry for that actually...* and *PSELL 2 Sorry my dear, don't mind please. I couldn't hold it tightly*, and *PSELL 6 Oh I am sorry. I split tea over your clothes*. A wide marked difference lies in taking the responsibility where PSELL has got an edge over the SSELL group because the PSELL group have used more by 24% than the SSELL group by 7%. The PSELL participants were inclined to take the responsibility in order to minimize the offence, *PSELL 7 I am so sorry for the drops that fell over your*

clothes. Therefore, apologize me [sic], and PSELL 12 I apologize for all this, whereas two SSELL participants even don't bother to make an apology as necessary in the situation. As a part of SSELL group culture, an offence is not perceived in the circle of friends as severe because it shows celebration of solidarity between interlocutors. In terms of the PSELL group culture in which such an act is highly condemned and seek an immediate repair for the loss in an informal setting. Thus, it is proved that the PSELL group showed a distinctive interlanguage by applying strategies that does not occur in the SSELL group.

In contrast, the SSELL group has also used the strategy of promise of forbearance with 24% frequency, for example, *SSELL 3 Oh! Let me wipe it. I hope you wouldn't mind it.* The PSELL group has used this strategy by 14%, for example, *PSELL 13 Oh, I am sorry but actually I was lost somewhere else. Whereas, PSELL 14 Oh sorry dear, PSELL 3 I am sorry friend. It's only a mistake. Please don't be angry.* Hence, it shows that the participants of the PSELL group rely more on the social norms and linguistic conventions of their mother tongue that are transferred in English. It also reveals that mother tongue helps the learners to comprehend and elaborate the pragmatic norms of TL in an appropriate manner which shows an enhancement in pragmatic competence resulting due to the occurrence of pragmatic transfer. The results showed that sociocultural norms of mother tongue were displayed that were integrated into the target language. Moreover, as part of PSELL culture where the speaker is bound not to go beyond the statement of apology because it is considered as an offence keeping in view the status of interlocutors. On the other hand, the SSELL group presented much explanations which manifests itself as a part of their cultural practice where the participants of this group were much inclined to provide explanations, and to reduce the size of offence and to mitigate the utterance of the speaker. Hence, the results showed that learners' reliance on the linguistic and cultural resources of their mother tongues create an ease in the learning process of L2 to achieve a high proficiency in the target language. As a concluding note here, the data infers that the participants of PSELL group were found more indirect than the SSELL group who were found using direct strategies while accomplishing the speech act of apology of an old friend. Similarly, the reception of accountability would be regarded by hearer (henceforth, H) as an apology, while rejection of accountability would be anticipated as speaker's (henceforth, S's) rejection of the need to apologize.

4.2 Speech Act: Request

Situation 1: In this situation a problem has occurred to the laptop of a student wherein help is required either to fix the problem or to help the requestee accordingly. Moreover, the interlocutors are holding almost same status and power and there is less social or status distance.

Table 4.4 Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 1 for Request

Strategy of Requests	Tokens/Definitions	SSELL		PSELL		Contents of situation
		Pragmatic transfer	%	Pragmatic transfer	%	
Direct	Imperative	2	13%	3	20%	A friend is making a request to another friend to fix the laptop
	Explicit performative	7	46%	9	60%	
	Hedged Performative	4	26%	7	46%	
	Goal statement	3	20%	4	26%	
	Want statement	6	40%	9	60%	
Conventionally Indirect (CI)	Ability or permission	13	86%	10	66%	
	Availability	3	20%	5	33%	
Non-Conventionally Indirect (NCI)	Question Hint	2	13%	4	26%	
	Statement Hint	7	46%	5	33%	

As above table 4.4 shows that both the groups have almost used a range of request strategies in this situation, in other words displayed the same results during the accomplishment of request as a speech act. The results showed that ELL relies on the use of various in/direct strategies due to interference of the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer which was used as a resource for accomplishing different communicative tasks. Moreover, both the groups tend to develop a world view through pragmatic transfer which helps them in achieving pragmatic competence in learning English. Further, both the groups' i-e the SSELL only by (13%), and the PSELL by (20%) which shows less inclination of the participants to the use of imperative and has seldom used as a strategy. From the above results, it could be asserted that using the same request strategies with senior members vary from context to context as it suggests that the speaker has an influence over the listener. So,

learners of English language exploit the sociopragmatic norms of their native culture using the pattern many times in their responses to the English WDCT.

The overall results showed that the presentation of the students was predisposed by their mother tongue and native culture. It reveals several examples of pragmatic transfer that show an inclination of the participants using sociopragmatic norms of the SSELL and PSELL group languages and cultures when realizing the speech act in English. In addition to the sub type of pragmatic transfer i.e., sociopragmatic transfer, the study establishes that the participants' used the sociopragmatic norms of their language and culture when responding to the English WDCT. Thus, the occurrence of the phenomenon results in the use of terminologies and structures that does not follow the established norms of English language.

The participants mostly employed the strategy of using Head Act in the accomplishment of a request to avoid the performance of a face threatening act. The results showed that strategies for forwarding a request have different levels of directness; that is, they differ in the length of the inferential pathway in which the hearer must follow in order to attribute requestive intent to the utterance (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989). The data also showed that degree of indirectness of a request is related to its politeness which is transported from mother tongue, and much cultural elements of the mother tongue are incorporated in the target language through sociopragmatic transfer. In the above table, classificatory framework of request shows that five sub-strategies used by the participants in this study can be interpreted as both in/direct request strategies. Moreover, it shows that an integration of two languages pragmatic norms increases the pragmatic competence of the learners in the learning process of English. The imperative is the most direct sub-strategy of all. It derives its requestive force from the grammatical mood itself. An example of an imperative request from PSELL group such as: *PSELL 6 Please lend me your laptop for few days*. In another example *PSELL1 Please come here and solve my problem*. So far, the SSELL group is concerned, the participants use also imperatives, like *SSELL 7 please give me your laptop*. And *SSELL 2 help me and get me out of this trouble*. This sub-strategy of imperative as a request type is used frequently by the participants of both the groups. Most important to mention here that much alerters have used such as "Dear friend", "dear fellow" followed as a strategy by both the groups simultaneously to get the attention of the hearer as to let him know about the significance of the request. These

alerters and attention getters have used with an equal proportion by both the groups to increase the curiosity of the hearer that what the speaker wants him to do.

The second most direct sub-strategy which is used almost with equal proportion by the participants of both the groups, is the use of explicit performative request wherein the speaker names the illocutionary intent explicitly, with a relevant illocutionary verb, such as, *SSELL 2 I request you to please fix my laptop*. In the use of this feature for request, the SSELL group used it as a device seven times by 46 %, and the PSELL group has used it 9 times by 60% shows that the emphasis is particularly made in order to develop a force at the hearers' end for compliance of the act. The second of these verbs, conveys much greater formality, and also suggests that the requestee is in a position of authority with respect to the use of modalities as in the example, *SSELL 13 can you please fix my laptop?* and *SSELL 9 would you please fix my laptop?* The use of these performative verbs is cautiously chosen with an intention to produce a polite effect as Quinn (1996a, p. 61) observes. Thus, such request form probably conveys more politeness with a requestive force, for example, *SSELL 8 I need your help. Please can you do me a favour?* Thus, it provides a fairly accurate notion of the degree of politeness conveyed by adopting an indirect strategy. In the direct sub-strategy of 'hedged performative', the SSELL group has used more performative verbs that is modified by a modal verb, such as, *SSELL 1 would like you to help me out, something is wrong with my laptop*. In this example, the modal verb, *would like* then creates a hedge on the illocutionary force of the performative verb makes the request less direct than using explicit performative strategy which is perceived as more direct. In this connection, the SSELL group has used hedged performative for 4 times by 26%, and the SSELL group has used it for 7 times, almost twice bigger percentage of 46% than the other group.

In the fourth direct sub-strategy, the Goal statement, the participants of both the groups stated the desired state of affairs, or goal of the request, and the SSELL participants stands by 20%, whereas 26% by the participants of PSELL which is used equally. For example, *SSELL 6 Can you help me? My laptop is not working and I have to submit an assignment. Can you fix my laptop? I will be very thankful*. This strategy of Goal statement conveys certain optimism that the requestee will comply with the act of request, and in this way conveys a degree of positive politeness. On the other hand, *PSELL 2 Can you do me a favour?* Following this example, the participant puts forward his/her desire for the goal of the request to be realized, using

a relevant modal verb. The force of Want statements has used by SSELL group by 40% and the PSELL group has used it by 60%. Moreover, want statements are viewed as imposition in PSELL culture and are less inappropriate because it is very common among their communities that it keeps the hearer bound to comply with the request of the speaker by all means, in contrast it is considered more appropriate among SSELL group as their culture allows them to become flexible and leave a social distance, and a preference is given to use of want statements.

Moreover, in query preparatory request strategy, the participant asks about a condition or state necessary for the request to be fulfilled. The data shows that both the group fairly opted for the use of a modal verb to emphasize the force and urgency of the matter. For example, *SSELL 7 Can you please help me with my laptop? I have to write an urgent assignment.* This strategy is used by the participants of the study with frequency of 86% by SSELL group, and the PSELL group has used it with frequency of 66% as a strategy. In the above example, making a request for obtaining permission by using a modal verb can legitimately be regarded as question for granting permission, the selection of “*Can/Could you*” seems to convey this sense more overtly, and hence, places the speaker more clearly in a subordinate position to the hearer. For example, *PSELL 2 Can you have a quick look at it? Please!* This example shows the use of query preparatory sub-strategy in which the speaker questions the condition that goods are available, using the verb, “there is/ there are” or the verb, “have”. This strategy is very less used by both the groups in making a request, the SSELL group uses by 20%, and the PSELL group by 33%. In this way the utterance made by the participants achieves the status of a request proper and a deeper attention is paid to what is being requested by the speaker? For example, *PSELL 1 Hello dear, I need your laptop for preparing an assignment. If your laptop is free then please let me borrow it. SSELL 1 hey! I need a favour from you.* And due to the nature of the situations selected for the present study, this request type is common enough to merit recognition as a strategy of its own among both groups.

Non-conventionally indirect requests (hints), illustrated in the above table shows that two sub-strategies have used by SSELL group with frequency of 13%, and PSELL group by 26 %, can be classified as non-conventionally indirect requests, or hints. It is pertinent to mention here the CCSARP taxonomy of request strategies (Blum-Kulka et al 1989; CCSARP 1989) of hints are sub-classified as “strong” or “mild”. This distinction between strong and mild hints appears to rest on the

dimension of propositional transparency which focuses on how explicitly the utterance conveys what it is that the hearer is requested to do. For example, *PSELL 8 Dear friend, actually I was doing my assignment, suddenly my laptop stopped working. I am very upset. Will you please help me in this situation?* Another example from the same group, *PSELL 7 Dear fellow, my laptop has stopped working, so please help me in this regard. I will be thankful.* This example shows that a question hint takes the form of an interrogative utterance that functions as a request, but it is not conventionalized as a request form. As question hints do not convey requestive force by virtue of their formal properties, their requestive force is heavily dependent on context. Examples of question hints are, like, *PSELL 4 Can you fix my laptop, please!* and *PSELL 3 Can you please fix it.* The hearer, thus, infers that the requestee wants either to take his laptop for some days or the problem occurred to laptop might be fixed. Moreover, it is demonstrated that the hearer always feels at stake and avoids naming the addressee to soften the influence of the imposition which results as an offence at the hearer end. For example, *PSELL 4 Dear, could you please fix this issue? PSELL 3 my dear friend, please give me your laptop.* Likewise, the word ‘dear’ is used to divert the attention of the hearer in order to realise the force or intent of the request at the end of the requestee.

Situation 2: In this second situation, the status and power relationship is equal. A newly enrolled student has missed a few lectures delivered earlier by the teacher where help is being sought in the form of a request to borrow notes from another classmate who just got an introduction with the requestee.

In this situation too, different strategies are displayed where transference from the mother tongue is visible in the accomplishment of the speech act of request. Moreover, these strategies are materialized and transmitted through the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer which has been used as a resource for the accomplishment of communicative task. The result shows that mother tongue linguistic and cultural resources are transferred in English, and learners are not capable to learn the pragmatic norms of English independently rather rely much on the use of L1 social norms and conventions.

The use of alerters such as “Dear friend”, “dear fellow” has almost been used as a strategy by both the groups simultaneously to get the attention of the hearer as to let him know about the significance of the request. These alerters and attention getters are used with an equal proportion by both the groups to increase the curiosity of the

hearer that what the speaker wants him to do. In the above, highly context-specific features (e.g., that the requestee has got admission in a university and have missed a few lectures delivered earlier by his or her teacher. Now, the requestee is seeking help of a classmate whom he doesn't know longer, and put forward a request to get some notes or hints about the missing lectures. In the above, too, context-specific features (e.g., the knowledge— shared and known to be shared — of the interlocutors that the student has to write an assignment which is due by tomorrow requires an immediate remedy. For example, *PSELL 6 please will you give me your previous lectures notes? Will you help me?*

Table 4.5. Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 2 for Request

Strategy of Requests	Tokens/Definitions	SSELL		PSELL		Contents of situation
		Pragmatic transfer	%	Pragmatic transfer	%	
Direct	Imperative	1	7%	2	13%	A friend is making request to a new friend for lending him some notes
	Explicit performative	3	20%	4	26%	
	Hedged Performative	4	26%	3	20%	
	Goal statement	3	20%	4	26%	
	Want statement	6	40%	7	46%	
Conventionally Indirect (CI)	Ability or permission	5	33%	6	40%	
	Availability	2	13%	1	7%	
Non-Conventionally Indirect (NCI)	Question Hint	2	13%	3	20%	
	Statement Hint	7	46%	5	33%	

The second most direct sub-strategy which is used almost with equal proportion by the participants of both the groups, SSELL group by 20% and PSELL group by 26%, is the use of explicit performative request wherein the speaker names the illocutionary intent explicitly, with a relevant illocutionary verb, such as, *SSELL 8 I am new here and I don't have any notes. Kindly give me your notes. Can you please share it with me?* The emphasis is particularly made in order to develop a force at the hearers' end for compliance with the act. In the direct sub-strategy of 'hedged performative', the SSELL group has used more performative verb that is replaced with a modal verb such as these verbs that conveys much greater formality, and also suggests that the requestee occupies a position of power in terms of the requester's end as in the

example, *PSELL 5 hello dear, please would you like to share with me the notes of previous lectures? PSELL 7 my dear fellow please help me about the previous lectures I missed.* The use of these performative verbs is done with an intention to produce a polite effect in the accomplishment of request. Thus, such request form probably conveys more politeness, for example, *PSELL 6 I am in a dire need of your help. Please help me.* Likewise, it provides a fairly accurate notion of the degree of politeness found among both the groups which are accomplished by adopting an indirect strategy. In this example, the modal verb, *would you like* then creates a hedge on the illocutionary force of the performative verb which makes the request less direct than the explicit performative strategy.

In the fourth direct sub-strategy, the goal statement, the participants of both the groups state the preferred state of affairs or an objective of the request, and the SSELL group stands by 20%, whereas 26% by the participants of PSELL which has been used equally. For example, this strategy of goal statement conveys certain optimism that the requestee will comply with the request, and in this way conveys a degree of positive politeness. For instance, *PSELL 2 Dear, I have missed few lectures. Please help me in this regard.* Following this example, the speaker expresses his or her want to fulfill the true realisation of the request by using an appropriate modal verb. The force of Want statements is used by SSELL group 40% and the PSELL group 46% with almost the same proportion and prioritizes to develop a want statement to avoid any imposition on the hearer. Moreover, want statements are considered as imposition on hearer and bounds hearer to comply with the forwarded request, and becomes mandatory in PSELL culture which are regarded as less inappropriate because it keeps the hearer bound to comply with the request of the speaker by all means, while it is considered more appropriate among SSELL group as their culture allows them to become flexible and leave a social distance and preference is given to use of want statements. For example, *SSELL 9 would like you to give me the notes on the lectures I have missed?*

In query preparatory (henceforth, QP) requests, the speaker asks about a condition necessary for the request to be fulfilled. The data revealed that both the group fairly opted for the use of a modal verb to emphasize the force and urgency of the matter. The most common strategy used both by Pashtu and Saraiki speakers was the preparatory ('can I, could I?') *PSELL 8 could you please provide me notes,* and PSELL group used it slightly more often than SSELL participants, although the

differences do not stand significant. In this regard, the speakers of both the groups bother about the conditions necessary for the request to be fulfilled. The data shows that both the group fairly opted for the use of a modal verb to emphasize the force and urgency of the matter. *I will return it well in time*. It is hereby inferred from the results that different situations do not seem to have an important effect on the use of the preparatory strategy. For example, *PSELL 6 I am in a dire need of your help. Please help me*. The differences related to other strategies (mood derivable, hints and want statements) were only marginal. Similarly, Requests for permission using the modal verb can legitimately be regarded as questions about the hearer's permission, the selection of "*Can you/Could you*" seems to convey this sense more overtly, and hence, place the speaker more clearly in a subordinate position to the hearer.

Another query preparatory sub-strategy is one in which the utterance made by the participants achieves the status of a request proper, and a deeper attention is paid to what the speaker want him to do? For example, *SSELL 6 Hi, please give me your notes on the lectures that I have missed. SSELL 13 my dear fellow, actually I was ill. Please give me notes*. Such kind of examples of request by itself generates a next strategy. Moreover, non-conventionally indirect requests (hints), illustrated in the table shows that two sub-strategies have simultaneously used by the participants of SSELL by 13% and PSELL by 20%, which are classified as non-conventionally indirect requests, or hints. Defining hints that are recognized as indirect question forms which cannot be conventionalized in the language, and thus entail more inference at the end of hearer to develop the speaker's level of commitment behind the request. In this regard, Weizman (1989, 1993) asserted that hints may vary at two distinct levels. The first is illocutionary transparency that focuses on how directly the utterance conveys requestive force. The other is propositional transparency that illustrates how explicitly the utterance conveys what it is that the hearer is requested to do. Blum-Kulka et al (1989; CCSARP 1989) hints are sub-classified known as strong or mild. This classification of strong and mild hints seems to rest on the dimension of propositional transparency. For example, *PSELL 3 hello, I am new here. Can you please help me with some notes? PSELL 4 hello friend, actually I really want your help. Will you lend me your notes?*

On the other hand, a question hint is an interrogative utterance which functions as a request, but that couldn't be conventionalized as a form of request, nor stand alone as a request (unlike interrogative forms such as "Can I?" or "May I?"

which are so conventionalized) as seen in the above examples. Most important to mention here is that question hints do not convey requestive force by virtue of their formal properties; their requestive force is heavily dependent on context. Examples of question hints are, like, *PSELL 5 excuse me. Can I have your notes taking register please because I missed few earlier lectures? I make sure the safe return of your register. SSELL 3 excuse me dear, would you please give me some notes on the previous lectures?* Both the SSELL group by 7%, and the PSELL group by 13% speakers used modal verbs in this situation which are more used by PSELL group, such as *PSELL 4 Can you please provide me with the notes on missing lectures? PSELL 3 would you please provide me with the lectures I missed.* The PSELL group have used the word please as a politeness marker with an intention to produce an effect and conveys broader meanings at the end of the hearer, like, *PSELL1 hello, how are you? Would you like to share your notes with me? PSELL 8 I was busy in some other activities and I missed a few lectures. So, will you please give me your notes?*

Although many alerters have been used in the accomplishment of requests by both the groups while mainly to get the attention of the requestee. The SSELL and PSELL both the groups' speakers also tended to use the addressee's attention. For example, *PSELL 5 hello dear, please would you like to share with me the notes of previous lectures? PSELL 7 my dear fellow please helps me about the previous lectures I missed.* The use of alerters is also related to context and both groups use more alerters in the first and second in situation. *SSELL 3 hello, I will be thankful to you if you provide me with notes. PSELL 10 hello friend, I was absent and missed a few lectures. Would you please help me? PSELL 12 hi do you have notes on the previous lectures? Can you share them with me?* It becomes clear from the above examples that the participants have inserted the alerters and modal verbs to soften the force of the forwarded request.

It is interesting to mention here that the impact of the participants' language and culture was exhibited in the manifestation of sociopragmatic transfer. This pragmatic failure occurred to participants due to misjudgment of social relation and distance with others and the point of imposition of their requests. For instance, *SSELL 6 hello, please do me a favour. Can you share the notes of the previous lectures? SSELL 9 hello dear, how are you? Glad to meet you. Would you please share your notes with me? I will appreciate that.* As observed in the first situation, it is true with this situation that sociopragmatic transfer can be seen whereby the participants'

manipulation of native discourse strategies have used to thrust others to collaborate with their requests. By overlooking at the imposition of the request and the reserved social relation with others is an attribute of the local speech communities that highlights cooperation among its members. The idea of exaggerating a speaker's urge to which a requestee is immediately required to grant an approval is a routine which is resorted to by natives. In such expressions, genuineness is over represented and the hearer's co-operation is depicted as profoundly required to put the requester at comfort. The strategy is mainly used to put force on the hearer and to escalate his/her kindness with the speaker's needs.

On the other hand, a type of pragmalinguistic transfer could be seen in a response, like, *SSELL 1 Assalam-u- Alaikum (May God bestow His blessings upon you!), I am new here and I have missed some lectures. Can you please help me with some notes on it?* Where an addressee's term is directly taken from his religious affiliations and religion bound culture. It presented that the Islamic religion and the relationship-based culture had an influence on the performance of the participants. The participant was inclined to pragmalinguistic transfer when the participant produces Islamic greetings in their English responses. Such as *SSELL 4 Hi bro, I am your classmate. I request you to please provide me with notes on the previous lectures.* Several instances of pragmatic transfer were evident in the data as the participants have utilized the linguistic and cultural norms when comprehending the speech act in English resulting in the deviation from the rules of the target language. The following section discusses the results of situation three that focuses on the speech act of request.

Situation 3: In this situation, a student is requesting his friends, who are making noise, to be quiet as the requestee was unable to concentrate on his reading a book in the library which according to requestee is not a public place. Like the previous situation, status of the interlocutors is same in this situation. Below table displays the results with percentages of both groups occurrence of pragmatic transfer.

In this situation, the use of alerters such as "Dear friend", "dear fellow" has been used as an indirect discourse strategy by both the groups simultaneously to get the attention of the hearer as to let him know about the significance of the request. These alerters and attention getters are used with an equal proportion by both the groups to increase the curiosity of the hearer that what the speaker wants them to do. Moreover, a participant has declared in words such as, *PSELL 5 excuse me friends,*

it's a library and I am reading but because of your noise, I can't concentrate on my study [sic]. In this situation less imperatives are used by both the groups, and remained polite in their expressions by using mostly indirect discourse strategies to compel the hearer for the compliance with the request. For example, *SSELL 8 excuse me, please. Can you people be quiet for some time as I have some important work to finish?*

Table 4.6 Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 3 for Request

Strategy of Requests	Tokens/Definitions	SSELL		PSELL		Contents of situation
		Pragmatic transfer	%	Pragmatic transfer	%	
Direct	Imperative	3	20%	3	20%	A friend is making request to other friends not to make noise in the library
	Explicit performative	4	26%	3	20%	
	Hedged Performative	4	26%	6	40%	
	Goal statement	3	20%	4	26%	
	Want statement	6	40%	3	20%	
Conventionally Indirect (CI)	Ability or permission	9	60%	10	66%	
	Availability	3	20%	2	13%	
Non-Conventionally Indirect (NCI)	Question Hint	2	13%	4	26%	
	Statement Hint	6	40%	5	33%	

The second most direct sub-strategy which has been used almost with equal proportion by participants of both the groups, whereas the SSELL by 26%, and PSELL by 20% is the use of explicit performative request wherein the speaker names the illocutionary intent explicitly by using an illocutionary verb such as, *SSELL 7 hi friends, here we come to read books but you are continuously talking which makes it very hard for me to concentrate.* In addition, an emphasis is particularly made in order to develop a force at the hearers' end for an immediate compliance with the act. In the direct sub-strategy of hedged performative, the SSELL group has used more performative verbs that are modified by a modal verb that conveys much greater formality, and also suggests that the requestee is in a position of authority with respect to the requester as in the example, *PSELL 8 will you please keep quiet? SSELL 3 would you please stop making noise?* Thus, such request form probably conveys more politeness, for example, *PSELL 6 please don't make noise.* Likewise, it provides a

fairly accurate notion of the degree of politeness found among both the groups that are transmitted by adopting an indirect strategy to soften the effects of the forwarded request, for example, *PSELL 3 would you like to stop making noise?* In this example, the modal verb, *would you like* then creates a hedge on the illocutionary force of the performative verb which makes the request less direct than the explicit performative strategy. For example, *PSELL 4 excuse me, can you please lower your voice?* And *PSELL 5 excuse me, will you please remain quiet?*

In the fourth direct sub-strategy of the goal statement, the participants of both the groups stated the desired state of affairs, or goal in the accomplishment of the request, and the SSELL group stands by 20%, whereas 26% by the participants of PSELL group which is almost used equally. For example, *PSELL 11 My friends, exam is going on, would you like to stop your noise*, thus, following upon this strategy of Goal statement conveys a certain optimism that the requestee will comply with the request, and in this way conveys a degree of positive politeness. For instance, *SSELL 8 hello listen! Can you be quiet?* *PSELL 9 hi do you people know that this is a library and you are supposed to be quiet and do not make noise*. Following this example, the speaker states his or her desire for the goal of the request to be realized, using a relevant modal verb. *SSELL 7 Excuse, would you like to stop making noise?* The force of want statements is observed as a strategy, the SSELL group used it by 40% which is twice bigger than the PSELL group with almost by 20% to avoid any imposition on the hearer. Moreover, want statements are considered as imposition on hearer as to accomplish the forwarded request becomes mandatory in PSELL culture and are less inappropriate because it is very common among their communities that it keeps the hearer bound to comply with the request of the speaker by all means, while it is considered more appropriate among SSELL group as their culture allows them to become flexible. For example, *SSELL 7 Dear fellows, as we know that we are all students, and we have to help one another in a right manner. Please make silence because other students are getting disturb with this act*.

In query preparatory requests strategies, the data revealed that both the group fairly opted for the use of a modal verb to emphasize the force and urgency of the matter. The most common strategy used both by Pashtu and Saraiki speakers was the preparatory, such as *PSELL8 can you? Guys! Can you keep quiet?* *SSELL 6 could you please be quiet?* In such form of requests, the speaker asks about a condition necessary for the request to be fulfilled. For accomplishment, a modal verb has used

to emphasize the force and urgency of the matter. I will return it well in time. It is inferred from the results of this situation that different situations do not seem to have an important effect on the use of the preparatory strategy. *SSELL 1 hey! Sorry I am trying to focus on my study. Would you please keep your voices a little low? Thanks.* Another query preparatory sub-strategy is one in which the speaker questions the condition that goods are available, using the verb, “there is/ there are” or the verb, “have”. In this way the utterance made by the participants achieves the status of a request proper and a deeper attention is paid to what is being meant by the speaker? For example, *SSELL 14 hey! You are supposed to be quiet, so kindly be quiet.* Therefore, rather than being grouped together with other question hints, this type of request has been classified as a separate conventional strategy. For example, *PSELL 13 excuse me, if you don't mind, please stop talking. It is a rule to keep silence in library.*

Among other strategies such as question hint that is an interrogative utterance, and functions as a request, but is not perceived as a conventionalized form of request (unlike interrogative forms such as “Can I?” or “May I?” which are so conventionalized). *SSELL 10 please, be silent! SSELL 12 Please! Don't make a noise. SSELL 2 please be quiet. I cannot concentrate on my studies.* As question hints do not convey requestive force by virtue of their formal properties, their requestive force is heavily dependent on context. Examples of question hints are, like, *SSELL 15 hello buddies. Please don't make a noise here. PSELL 11 excuse me students, you are sitting in the library. Would you please keep quiet? Many alerters are used in the case of requests by both the groups, for example, SSELL 8 my dear friends, please keep quiet. PSELL 15 hey friends, will you please stop disturbing me? and PSELL 4 sorry I am reading. Don't make noise please. PSELL 7 due to your noise, I am not able to concentrate. I request you to be quiet.* The overall results showed that the performance of the participants was influenced by their mother tongue and native culture. It found several instances of pragmatic transfer used as a resource, and have used the sociopragmatic norms by the SSELL and PSELL group when executing the speech act of request in English. Moreover, much politeness has been shown which indicates that forwarding a request requires to use certain social norms of the TL that are meant to be followed. It shows that both the groups relied on the use of mother tongue cultural and social norms that are primarily transferred in English.

4.3 Speech Act: Refusal

Situation 1: In this situation the students have decided to invite a professor (whom approval or acceptance for supervision during the event is a pre-requisite) to join them on the occasion. As a result, the professor has refused the invitation by employing different strategies. Moreover, the status of the interlocutors is not equal. The refusal strategies were employed by the SSELL and PSELL group overall with different patterns. According to the data, refusal strategies carried out by the participants can be classified into two types: (1) main strategies that can be used to realize the speech act of refusal, and (2) adjuncts which are strategies that could not stand alone as refusals, but modify the main strategy. Table 4.7 shows the frequency of occurrence of pragmatic transfer, and shows the results of the main refusal strategies utilized by the two groups.

Table 4.7 Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 1 for Refusal

Strategies of Refusal	Categories/Definition	SSELL		PSELL		Contents of situation
		Pragmatic transfer	%	Pragmatic transfer	%	
Direct refusal	Using performative verbs	4	26%	3	20%	A teacher is refusing an invitation of the students for a trip
	Non performative statement	1	7%	2	13%	
Indirect refusals	Regret	3	20%	4	26%	
	Wish	2	13%	2	13%	
	Excuse, reason, explanation	9	60%	7	47%	
	Alternatives	2	13%	3	20%	
	Promise of future acceptance	5	33%	6	40%	
	Attempt to dissuade hearer	6	40%	4	26%	
	Acceptance as a refusal	10	67%	12	80%	
	Avoidance	4	26%	2	13%	
	Positive opinion	2	13%	5	33%	
	Empathy	3	20%	2	13%	
Pause fillers	7	47%	4	26%		
Gratitude/appreciation	8	53%	9	60%		

The above table 4.7 shows that both Pashtu and Saraiki learners of English employed 10 different strategies. Pashtu participants have used by 20% direct strategies, whereas the SSELL group has employed a total of 26% direct strategy.

Providing reason/explanation (e.g., I have other plans) for refusals was the most employed strategy by both groups overall; the PSELL group has used this strategy by 47%, while the SSELL group has utilized it by 60%. For example, *PSELL 4 my dear students, I really want to join you but I cannot go due to my busy schedule. PSELL 5 I am sorry because I have to attend a marriage ceremony of my very close friend.*

The second most frequently used strategy was the direct refusal realized by negative ability (e.g., I can't). Even though Pashtu speakers seem to prefer to use this strategy with a higher frequency of 13%, the SSELL group also used this strategy as their second preferred by 7%. *PSELL 5 I wish but I cannot join you.* Another difference worthwhile to mention is that both the groups expressed refusals using regret (e.g., I'm sorry) by SSELL group 20%, and PSELL 26%, like *SSELL 6 I am sorry. I am already engaged. SSELL 7 sorry students I am busy.* And hedge (e.g., I am not sure) by the SSELL group has used with frequency of 7%, *SSELL 2 I will surely join you but I am busy with some work* which is slightly more than the Saraiki speakers who used regret by 20% and hedge by 7%. With regard to the strategy of requesting for information (e.g., what time is the party?), SSELL group has utilized it with a relatively higher frequency by 13% compared to PSELL learners of English by 26% in regret. In addition to these strategies, both groups have used adjuncts to mitigate their refusals, which are remarks that could not stand alone to function as a refusal (e.g., I'd love to, but...). *PSELL 1 I would like to go with you but I am too busy these days.* As Table 4.7 showed that both groups have used three types of adjuncts (i.e., positive opinion, gratitude, pause fillers) to mitigate their refusals, but the adjunct of willingness (e.g., actually I would like to come) was only used by the PSELL group with a low frequency of 7%. For example, *SSELL 8 I would like to go with you but I am busy these days.* Among the three types of adjuncts used by both groups, the most utilized was positive opinion (e.g., that sounds fun), though it seems to be more preferred by PSELL participants by 33% compared to Saraiki speakers only by 13%. Pause fillers (e.g., uhh, well, uhm etc.), *PSELL 13 Oh so sorry dear students, I have to attend some important meetings these days due to that I cannot join you.* However, pause fillers as a strategy has utilized more by SSELL group 47% than Pashtu learners of English by 26%.

Moreover, Sequence of refusal interactions was also examined according to the different functions of refusal strategies; that is, pre-refusals (i.e., initiating refusals), head acts (i.e., expressing refusals) and post-refusals (i.e.,

mitigating/concluding refusals) with an aim to explore how strategies are organized in real-time conversations. Head acts represent the minimal unit in the sequence that communicates refusals. Head acts can be either realized as direct *PSELL 1 No I cannot join you.* (e.g., I can't make it tonight) or indirect (e.g., I have an exam tomorrow). *SSELL 15 sorry to say that I have not joined you because I have to take exams.* *SSELL 14 my dear students, I wish to go with you people on a trip but as you know that I have an exam next week.*

The data in this study reported three different types of strategies that were used as head acts. Negative ability (e.g., no/I can't) *PSELL 11 No I cannot join you,* and *SSELL 7 sorry I wouldn't be able to join you* was categorized as direct, whereas reason/explanation and postponement (e.g., can I let you know later?) *PSELL 8 excuse me this time. I will join you on next trip* was coded as indirect. According to the percentages, the PSELL group predominantly never preferred the direct strategies over indirect ones. On the other hand, the SSELL group has used indirect strategies more, even though much of the participants from both the groups have utilized direct strategies as well. Even though the inclination to state the reason instead of declining the invitation directly might result from individual characteristics, a considerable number of PSELL participants who commented on their preference to state the reason in their refusals might imply that their production of refusals was influenced by native cultural norms. Pre-refusals are composed of one or more strategies that initiate the sequence and prepare the hearer for the upcoming refusal. *SSELL 13 sorry dear, you know about my job and I have also some work in my home. So, please don't angry to me.*

Moreover, the above table shows the frequency and percentage of pre-refusal strategies utilized by both groups. Pre-refusals not only start negotiation of refusals, but also externally modify the head act within the refusal sequence. *PSELL 5 Thank you so much for this invitation but I cannot join you for the trip.* According to the results displayed in the above table, even though the total number of pre-refusals employed by both groups was the same, the use of particular type of pre-refusal varied between two groups. *SSELL 3 I have a tight schedule these days. I can't join you.* The most common pre-refusal employed to initiate the negotiation for both groups was positive opinion. Example below illustrates the refusal interaction produced by a Pashtu learner of English. *PSELL 12 sorry* (Pre-refusal--Positive

opinion) *but you know, I am busy these days, so I don't have time for trip.* (Head act--Explanation).

The PSELL group data revealed that 33% of the L2 learners preferred to use positive opinion to modify their head acts, which was also a routine utilized by the SSELL participants at a distant rate in the data by 13%. Pause fillers (e.g., well, uhm), however, were less frequent in PSELL subjects' data 26% than the SSELL data 47%. Post-refusals are strategies that are used to highlight, repeat, rationalize, soften, or end the refusal sequence. While some speakers choose to employ one or more strategies, the others may not utilize any post-refusals at all. The results of the study show the frequency and percentage of post-refusals used by both groups. According to the results, the SSELL group has preferred to use regret, SSELL 2 *I am having a busy schedule. I cannot manage it.* SSELL 9 *sorry dear students, I have an important work at home,* SSELL 10 *I am having a busy schedule. I cannot manage it,* and SSELL 6 *sorry dear students; I have to attend a meeting,* which is twice as much as those used by Saraiki speakers.

On the other hand, the SSELL participants favoured reason/explanation more by 60% to mitigate their refusals, in comparison to Pashtu learners of English by 47%. Another point that is not reflected in the table is that none of the participants from each group employed any post-refusals at all. SSELL 7 *I am having a very busy schedule this week. Sorry, we can arrange it next week.* This example clearly illustrates on the strategies utilized by a Pashtu learner of English in a post refusal sequence. *I am having a very busy schedule this week* (negative ability--head-act) sorry (regret--post-refusal) we can arrange it next week (possibility of future acceptance--post-refusal). According to Beebe et al. (1990), pragmatic transfer can occur not only in preference of strategies and sequential organization of refusals, but also in the content of strategies. SSELL 15 *I have some reasons that's why I couldn't come.* Since the reason/explanation was the most preferred refusal strategy by both groups overall, and the content of this strategy was analyzed in order to explore what type(s) of explanations were considered appropriate and the differences between Pashtu learners of English and Saraiki learners of English and the difference is worth significant. For example, SSELL 13 *I am sorry but I am unable to go with you on trip because of my busy schedule. Enjoy your trip* PSELL 7 *I am sorry. I am already engaged.*

With regard to the content of explanations on the first episode (i.e., first conversational turn) of refusal negotiations, the PSELL group has preferred to use having exams/papers as an excuse by 47%, whereas SSELL group by 60% seemed to provide explanations that they were busy or had pre-planned activities without giving specific explanations. An intriguing point that was found in the data was that none of the PSELL participants and SSELL chose to opt for the strategy of providing any statement of principle or philosophy in their refusals. With a closer examination of the data, it was found that the PSELL group who did not provide specific reasons or no reasons at all in the first episode of their refusals, offered specific reasons upon insistence of the researcher, who worked as the conductor of the WDCTs. However, this was not the case with PSELL group; they consistently refused without giving any explanation to their interlocutor. Below is an example of the role play data from a Pashtu learner of English. *PSELL 4 I am very busy and wouldn't manage to supervise you. SSELL 14 thanks, but I am busy. So, I wouldn't be able to supervise you.* Initiating the refusal sequence for the first episode, the learner employed multiple strategies such as gratitude, future possibility etc., in addition to providing reason/explanation. Utilized as the refusal, she expressed the reason twice in the first episode, but the reason was not specifically explained. On the contrary, the participant elucidated and elaborated on the details of the reasons upon insistence from the conductor of the role play. Another noteworthy point of this interaction was the switch from an indirect head act in the first episode to a direct head act in the second episode upon insistence. She was able to mitigate the direct refusal with detailed explanations to save the interlocutor's positive face, and emphasized the illocutionary force of the refusal to prevent further insistence, which posed a threat to her negative face. *PSELL 2 thanks, but I am a bit busy so, I wouldn't be able to supervise you. PSELL 13 my dear students, I have a desire to go with you on this trip but sorry.*

The SSELL participants began the refusal sequence with stating positive opinion (i.e., that sounds great), then expressed the reason without specifying any details. The first episode of the interaction continued with a direct head act (i.e., I'm gonna decline) and ended with regret (i.e., sorry) that mitigated the head act to save interlocutor's positive face. Upon insistence from the conductor of the WDCTs, in the second episode, the speaker continued to refuse by providing reasons. Even though the second reason provided more explanation compared to that in the first episode, still, it was not as specific or detailed as the reason provided by the Pashtu learner of

English. Concerning the preference for head acts in the second episode, the SSELL group consistently used direct head act with an acoustic emphasis on negation (i.e., I won't be able to make it) followed by gratitude to soften the illocutionary force of the refusal. It is, therefore, contended that participants of PSELL group rejected an abrupt denial rather supported indirect refusal with a motive not to offend the hearer as well as to save his own face. On the other hand, the participants of SSELL group are portrayed as more direct in terms of the same status and more indirect in case of lower-upper status context.

Situation 2: In this situation a friend is requesting another colleague to bring a cup of tea but he/she refuses to comply with the request. The status of the interlocutors is the same. Table 4.8 shows usage frequency of the main refusal strategies utilized by the two groups.

Table 4.8 Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 2

Strategies of Refusal	Categories/Definition	SSELL		PSELL		Contents of situation
		Pragmatic transfer	%	Pragmatic transfer	%	
Direct refusal	Using performative verbs	7	47%	6	40%	A friend is refusing the request of working mate in a salon
	Non performative statement	3	20%	2	13%	
Indirect refusals	Regret	9	60%	12	80%	
	Wish	3	20%	2	13%	
	Excuse, reason, explanation	12	80%	10	67%	
	Alternatives	1	7%	1	7%	
	Attempt to dissuade hearer	6	40%	2	13%	
	Acceptance as a refusal	8	53%	9	60%	
	Avoidance	6	40%	2	13%	
	Positive opinion	7	47%	5	33%	
	Empathy	1	7%	-	-	
	Pause fillers	7	47%	3	20%	
Gratitude/appreciation	5	33%	9	60%		

Furthermore, the results of the current study demonstrated that Pashtu and Saraiki English language learners employed 13 different strategies. Pashtu speakers used a total of 40 % strategies by using performative verbs, whereas the SSELL group has employed a total of 47% by using this strategy. So far providing reason/explanation as

a strategy (e.g., I have other plans) for refusals was the most employed strategy for both groups overall; the PSELL group has used this strategy by 67%, while the SSELL group has utilized it by 80%. *PSELL 3 I am sorry because I am busy. PSELL 14 I am sorry because I am busy in some work.* The second most frequently used strategy was the direct refusal realized by negative ability (e.g., I can't). *PSELL 6 sorry I cannot do this job because I have to do some work in my home.* Even though Pashtu speakers seem to prefer to use this strategy with a frequency by 13%, the SSELL group has also equally used this strategy by 20%. Another difference worthwhile to mention is that both the groups have expressed refusals using regret (e.g., I'm sorry) PSELL group by 80%, and SSELL group has used it by 60%, and the use of hedge (e.g., I am not sure) employed by PSELL group by 13%, and SSELL group by 20%, like *PSELL 12 sorry I am busy this time PSELL 13 sorry I am busy this moment*, which is slightly less than the Saraiki speakers who used regret by 60% and hedge by 20%. With regard to the strategy of requesting for information, *PSELL 7 sorry, I am busy.* SSELL group has utilized it with almost same frequency by 7% compared to PSELL learners of English by 7%. For example, *PSELL 6 no let me sweep the floor first.*

Moreover, the above table 4.8 shows that both groups have used three types of adjuncts (i.e., positive opinion, gratitude, pause fillers) to mitigate their refusals, but the adjunct of willingness was only used by the PSELL group with a low frequency. *SSELL 8 I have some pain in my legs, otherwise I will make it for both of you. I am so sorry.* Among the three types of adjuncts used by both groups, the most utilized was positive opinion (e.g., that sounds fun), though it seems to be less preferred by PSELL participants by 33% compared to Saraiki speakers by 47%. Pause fillers, like *SSELL 9 oh yes! First let me do my work.* However, these were utilized relatively more by SSELL group by 47% than Pashtu learners of English by 20%. The data in this study reported three different types of strategies that were used as head acts. Negative ability has been categorized as direct, whereas reason/explanation and postponement are coded as indirect. *PSELL 11 I am busy now. Please don't mind. As soon as I get free, I will serve you a cup of tea.* According to the results, the SSELL group predominantly preferred the direct strategies by 57% over indirect ones. On the other hand, the PSELL group has used direct strategies more by 43%. For example, *SSELL 10 I have to clean the floor. Can you please ask someone else?*

A considerable number of PSELL participants who commented on their preference to state the reason in their refusals might imply that their production of refusals was influenced by native cultural norms, which has been discussed in the discussion section. *SSELL 15 I am not feeling well.* Pre-refusals are composed of one or more strategies that initiate the sequence and prepare the hearer for the upcoming refusal. Table 4.8 shows the frequency and percentage of pre-refusal strategies utilized by both the groups. The primary function of Pre-refusals as a strategy was used by the participants with an intention towards negotiation of refusals, such as *SSELL 5 my dear colleague, as you know that I would have to do other things.* The most common pre-refusal employed to initiate the negotiation for both groups was positive opinion. Example below illustrates the refusal interaction produced by a Saraiki learner of English. *SSELL 14 sorry for refusal but you know that I am busy and cleaning my shop. So, please do it on your own.*

The SSELL group data revealed that 47% of the L2 learners preferred to use positive opinion to modify their head acts. Pause fillers as a strategy has been used more frequent in SSELL participant's data by 47% than the PSELL data by 20%. For instance, *PSELL 8 sorry I am so tired and want to have some rest. So, I cannot.* Table 4.8 shows the frequency and percentage of post-refusals used by both groups. *PSELL 6 Actually I have a severe headache; I am sorry I cannot get a cup of coffee.* On the other hand, the SSELL participants have used reason/explanation more by 80% to mitigate their refusals, in comparison to Pashtu learners of English by 67%. Another point that is not reflected in the table is that none of the participants from PSELL group employ the strategy of empathy for any post-refusals at all. *PSELL 12 please don't mind. I can't fetch a cup of tea for you.* The Example illustrates strategies followed by a Pashtu learner of English in a post refusal sequence. So, I don't think that I can make it (negative ability--head-act) sorry (regret--post-refusal) maybe next time (possibility of future acceptance--post-refusal).

The most preferred post-refusal strategy for Pashtu learners of English was regret by 80%, while Saraiki learners of English have used reason/explanation to mitigate main refusals with the highest frequency by 80%. Likewise, Reason/explanation as a strategy was the most frequently used refusal strategy by both groups. The participants of the study expressed various explanations when they refused the request. *SSELL 7 I am not feeling good.* Since the reason/explanation was the most preferred refusal strategy by both groups overall, the content of this strategy

was analyzed in order to explore what type(s) of explanations were considered appropriate and the differences between Pashtu learners of English and Saraiki learners of English and the difference is not significant. For example, *PSELL 1 you can see I am sweeping the salon and my hands are dirty.*

An important point that was found in the data was that 7% of the PSELL participants and 7% of the SSELL chose not to provide any reasons in their refusals. *SSELL 8 I am sorry but I am sweeping floor and my hands are not clean too.* With a closer examination of the data, it was found that the PSELL group who did not provide specific reasons or no reasons at all in the first episode of their refusals, *PSELL 4 oh! I will surely bring it for you but I am busy now.* However, this was not the case with PSELL group; they consistently refused without giving any explanation to their interlocutor. Concerning the preference for head acts in the second episode, the SSELL group consistently used direct head act with an acoustic emphasis on negation followed by gratitude to soften the illocutionary force of the refusal. *SSELL 7 sorry my dear I am busy. SSELL 9 I am in hurry. SSELL 3 I am busy.*

One direct strategy chosen by all research participants, whether to their equal status interlocutors or higher status interlocutors, was giving negative willingness. However, this negative willingness was followed by other strategies, such as giving reasons or statement of regret. The absence of performing direct strategy by only giving negative willingness indicated that all participants seemed to be politer by lessening the degree of directness. Giving alternatives was less chosen by the participants have refused the request given by their working mates or equal status interlocutors. Giving alternatives, according to Chen (1995) is to soften the threatening power of refusals. In this situation, the participants are refusing the request forwarded by the speaker prefer to refuse their classmates 'refusals', several participants tried to give alternatives. This is resorted here that the participants of both the groups wanted to keep their friendship in harmony by saving their friends 'positive face'. Therefore, it is inferred from the data that in situation 2, the participant chose reasons and explanation by 80% by SSELL group, and 67% by PSELL group, following the statements of regret SSELL group by 60%, and PSELL group by 80%, and giving positive opinion, PSELL group employed this strategy with frequency of 33%, whereas SSELL group used it with relatively higher degree of 47%. The results are significant in the sense that most participants choose indirect

refusals. This confirms that as refusal is one of the speech acts that can threaten the hearer's face, the speaker tends to mitigate the refusal.

Situation 3: In this situation, a student having computer literacy is refusing the request of a fellow facing a problem that has just occurred in his/her laptop. As a result, the computer expert (interlocutors are having same status) refuses the request of the friend by employing different strategies.

Below are the obtained results for the speech acts of refusal.

Table 4.9 Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 3 for Refusal

Strategies of Refusal	Categories/Definition	SSELL		PSELL		Contents of situation
		Pragmatic transfer	%	Pragmatic transfer	%	
Direct refusal	Using performative verbs	2	13%	3	20%	An expert of computer is refusing the request of his friend to fix his/her laptop
	Non performative statement	-	-	-	-	
Indirect refusals	Regret	7	47%	8	53%	
	Wish	1	7%	-	-	
	Excuse, reason, explanation	12	80%	10	67%	
	Alternatives	6	40%	7	47%	
	Promise of future acceptance	5	33%	6	40%	
	Attempt to dissuade hearer	4	26%	2	13%	
	Acceptance as a refusal	10	67%	12	80%	
	Positive opinion	9	60%	10	67%	
	Pause fillers	2	13%	4	26%	
Gratitude/appreciation	3	20%	5	33%		

According to the data, refusal strategies are used in the realization of the speech act of refusal which is strategies that do not stand alone as refusals, but modify the main strategy. The results show usage frequency of the main refusal strategies utilized by the two groups. As Table 4.9 shows, both speakers of Pashtu English and Saraiki learners of English employed different strategies. Pashtu speakers have used a total of 33% direct refusals, whereas Saraiki speakers employed a total of 13% direct refusal strategies. Among these strategies, the strategy of reason/explanation and acceptance as refusal are used with relatively higher degrees. The usage frequency of making the provision of explanation was used by PSELL with frequency of 67%, and SSELL

group has used it with frequency of 80%. For example, *PSELL 4 I am unable to fix the issue, and I am sorry that I couldn't help you in the hour of need. SSELL 8 I am really sorry and feel ashamed to refuse your request but I also have exams and my much work is still pending, I cannot help you.* The PSELL group has used the strategy of acceptance of refusal by 80%, while the SSELL group has utilized it by 67%. For example, *PSELL 15 sorry I cannot help you because I am busy in doing my own assignments which is meant to be submitted by tomorrow. PSELL 9 dear I know your problem but I am already occupied with many things to do. I cannot help you this time.*

The second most frequently used strategy was the direct refusal realized by negative ability (e.g., I can't). *PSELL 7 I wish but I can't.* Even though Pashtu speakers seem to prefer to use this strategy with a higher frequency 20%; the SSELL group has also used this strategy by 13%. *SSELL 9 I cannot help you.* Another difference worthwhile to mention is that PSELL group stand significant considering the use of non performative verbs, and used it by 13%, on the other hand, it is quite astonishing to know that none of the SSELL group participants has used non performative verbs as a refusal strategy. The data showed that both the groups have expressed refusals using regret by 47% by SSELL participants, and has used it by PSELL group by 53%. Like, *SSELL 13 I am sorry, I don't have spare time.* The PSELL group has employed the strategy of alternative by 47%, which is slightly more than the Saraiki speakers who have used it by 40%. In addition to these strategies, both groups have used positive opinion as a strategy to intensify the force behind the act of refusals, the SSELL group employed it by 60%, while PSELL group use it by 67%. Among other strategies, the strategy of gratitude was also employed, the SSELL group opted for it by 20% which is lesser than PSELL by 33%. Another strategy of pause filler was also used by both the groups, i.e., the SSELL group has used it by 13% where PSELL group stands twice bigger in frequency than PSELL group by 26%. For example, *PSELL 12 I'd really like to help but I am really busy so I can't spare time. PSELL 13 Oh I wish I could but I am busy. I have to complete my own work.* Among the three types of adjuncts used by both groups, the most utilized was positive opinion, though it seems to be more preferred by PSELL participants 67% compared to Saraiki speakers 60%.

Moreover, Sequence of refusal interactions was also examined according to the different functions of refusal strategies; that is, pre-refusals (i.e., initiating

refusals), head acts (i.e., expressing refusals) and post-refusals (i.e., mitigating/concluding refusals) with an aim to explore how strategies are organized in real-time conversations. Head acts represent the minimal unit in the sequence that communicates refusals. Head acts can be either realized as direct (e.g., I can't make it tonight) *SSELL 2 I am not good in technology or fixing laptops* or indirect (e.g., I have an exam tomorrow). *PSELL 8 I have an exam next week so I don't have time. I can't help you.* The data in this study reported three different types of strategies that were used as head acts. Negative ability was highlighted as direct, whereas reason/explanation and postponement (e.g., can I let you know later?) was coded as indirect. A considerable number of PSELL participants who commented on their preference to state the reason in their refusals might imply that their production of refusals was influenced by native cultural norms. Pre-refusals are composed of one or more strategies that initiate the sequence and prepare the hearer for the upcoming refusal.

The results showed that pre-refusal strategies were also utilized by both the groups. Pre-refusals not only start negotiation of refusals, but also externally modify the head act within the refusal sequence. Like, *SSELL 6 I wish I could help you but I am sorry.* The most common pre-refusal employed to initiate the negotiation for both groups was positive opinion. Example below illustrates the refusal interaction produced by a Pashtu learner of English. *PSELL 10 I wish to do it for you, (Pre-refusal--Positive opinion) but I am busy right now (Head act--Explanation).* For instance, *PSELL 1 oh I really feel sorry for you. But I can't spare some time for it.* Post-refusals are strategies that are used to highlight, repeat, rationalize, soften, or end the refusal sequence. While some speakers choose to employ one or more strategies, the others may not utilize any post-refusals at all.

The PSELL group has preferred to use regret by 53%, which is as much as those used by Saraiki speakers by 47%. On the other hand, the SSELL participants favoured reason/explanation more by 80% to mitigate their refusals, in comparison to Saraiki learners of English 67%. Another point that is not reflected in the table is that 33.3 % of the participants from each group did not employ any post-refusals at all. Such as: *SSELL 9 gigantic apology, sorry because I am facing the same situation.* This example illustrates strategies produced by a SSELL participant in a post refusal sequence, *gigantic apology*, (negativeability--head-act) sorry (regret--post-refusal) *because I am facing the same situation* (possibility of future acceptance--post-

refusal), and *PSELL 8 I am sorry I cannot help you. PSELL 5 I am sorry I wouldn't be able to help you right now.*

The most preferred post-refusal strategy for Pashtu learners of English was regret, i.e., 53%, while Saraiki learners of English have used reason/explanation to mitigate main refusals with the highest frequency (i.e., 47%), as illustrated by the example below. *SSELL 10 I have just given (negative ability--head-act) my laptop to my brother he will fix it and (reason/explanation--post-refusal. Reason/explanation was the most frequently used refusal strategy by both groups. The participants of the study expressed various explanations when they refused the invitation. In this context, following Beebe et al. (1990) demonstrated that pragmatic transfer can occur not only in preference of strategies and sequential organization of refusals, but also in the content of strategies. SSELL 6 don't mind my friend, because I am busy in some important work. Since the reason/explanation was the most preferred refusal strategy by both groups overall, the content of this strategy was analyzed in order to explore what type(s) of explanations were considered appropriate and the differences between Pashtu learners of English and Saraiki learners of English and the difference is not significant. SSELL 12 As a matter of fact, I cannot give you my laptop. SSELL 13 sorry buddy, I have to go, can you ask someone else?*

According to the results of this situation, the PSELL group has preferred to use having exams/papers or some other things to do as an excuse by 67%, whereas SSELL group seemed to provide explanations that they were busy or had pre-planned activities without giving specific explanations. An intriguing point that was found in the data was that 80% of the PSELL participants and 33% of the PSELL chose not to provide any reasons in their refusals. However, this was not the case with PSELL group; they consistently refused without giving any explanation to their interlocutor. Below is an example of the role play data from a Pashtu learner of English. *PSELL 6 I have a very busy schedule. Therefore, I cannot help you.* Another noteworthy point of this interaction was the switch from an indirect head act in the first episode to a direct head act in the second episode upon insistence. The speaker was able to mitigate the direct refusal with detailed explanations to save the interlocutor's positive face, and emphasized the illocutionary force of the refusal to prevent further insistence, which posed a threat to her negative face. *SSELL 8 my dear. I can understand your problem but I have to attend my classes.*

The SSELL participants began the refusal sequence with stating positive opinion (i.e., that sounds great), then expressed the reason without specifying any details. The first episode of the interaction continued with a direct head act and ended with regret (i.e., sorry) that mitigated the head act to save interlocutor's positive face. On the other hand, one direct strategy chosen by all research participants, whether to their equal status interlocutors or higher status interlocutors, was giving negative willingness. However, this negative willingness was followed by other strategies, such as giving reasons or statement of regret. The absence of performing direct strategy by only giving negative willingness indicated that all participants seemed to be politer by lessening the degree of directness. The SSELL group employed this strategy by 26% wherein the PSELL group opted for it by only 13%, twice lesser as compare to SSELL group. Giving alternatives, the SSELL group has used it by 40%, and the PSELL group has employed it by 47%. According to Chen (1995) the primary function providing alternatives is to soften the threatening power of refusals. In this situation, the participants are refusing the request forwarded by the speaker prefer to refuse their classmates 'refusals', several participants tried to give alternatives. This is resorted here that the participants of both the groups wanted to keep their friendship in harmony by saving their friends 'positive face'.

4.4 Summary

The phenomenon of sociopragmatic transfer has been identified through investigating the use of discourse strategies by the learners of English. The learners' performance can be summarized as follows: the SSELL group has been influenced by L1 regarding the employment of Explanation; they opted for Explanations in high-status context more than PSELL group participants did in high/equal status contexts. Also, as far as providing reason as a strategy is concerned, it seems to increase in accordance with the interlocutors' status; it has been more attested in high-, low- than equal-status, which is once again in agreement with L1 norms. The only strategy that shares almost equal distribution is that of Repair. Hence, it can be said that positive transfer has been observed in using apology strategies, except for Responsibility which has been negatively transferred. As far as SSELL group is concerned, their speech act accomplishments in TL have been in line with L1 norms in the employment of Explanation, Responsibility and intensification. The SSELL participants have been inclined to using Explanation more in high-status contexts than

in low-/equal-status ones. Responsibility has almost remained constant in that only a relative decrease has been noted when apologizing to equal- and low status interlocutors.

Likewise, in both the groups, intensity has varied in accordance with the interlocutor's status. The Repair strategy has been in agreement with the mother tongue distribution. Like PSELL group, the employment of apology strategies appears to agree with the SSELL group, except for Responsibility that has been L1-driven. Thus, it can also be concluded that positive transfer has been operative in the utilization of apology strategies and, hence, the perception of the dominance variable, except for Responsibility which has been negatively transferred. However, the use of explanation as a strategy has only been relatively employed more by SSELL group than PSELL group in apologizing to a distant person. It has been noted that more reliance on L1 during explanation, again, seems to follow the social norms of L1 more than TL. As a consequence, negative sociopragmatic transfer has been operative in apologies of the PSELL group. Furthermore, the SSELL group has offered more explanation strategies, and relatively, more responsibility has been shown in high-I context whereas they have employed fewer or no repair strategies in low-I context. Both the repair and concern strategies have almost remained constant in high and low contexts.

The next chapter presents the analysis of the data collected through open oral role plays employed as the second data collection instrument for this study.

CHAPTER 5

DATA ANALYSIS-II

Overview of the chapter

This chapter focuses on the analysis of Open Oral Role Plays (See Appendix B) that consisted of nine situations which were audio recorded and later transcribed. Twelve participants, 6 males and 6 females participated in open role plays. The participants were selected through purposive sampling from section B of the same class/semester which consisted of 30 students. The same 9 situations are repeated in this tool which were used in the WDCTs. This chapter is divided into three sections; the first section presents a detailed analysis of the data collected from the participants on the speech act of apology. The second section focuses on the analysis of the data obtained on the speech act of request. The last section presents the analysis of the data gathered on the speech act of refusal. This chapter ends with a brief summary.

5.1 Speech Act: Apology

As there were three situations under each speech act, the data obtained from each situation has been analyzed separately.

Situation 1: In this situation a student who has been absent from classes seeks an apology of the chairperson of the department on the account of his or her absence from the classes. Moreover, the status between the interlocutors is different from each other rather the communication takes place between upper and lower status interlocutors. The figures in the following table indicate the frequency of pragmatic transfer. It is pertinent to mention here that in this situation the status is high as the professor holds a distinctive authority in the country of the researcher. Besides, the data of this situation have displayed different results which truly answer the research questions.

The below-given table 5.1 illustrates the results of both the groups culled from this situation that shows the frequency of the results in percentages. Most importantly, the responses of the participants were audio-recorded and transcribed later.

Note: The italicized text shows the actual utterances that are taken from the data collected from the participants.

**Table 5.1 Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups-
Situation 1 for Apology**

Types of Apology Strategy	SSELL		PSELL		Contents of Situation
	Pragmatic Transfer	%	Pragmatic transfer	%	
IFID	6	40%	9	60%	A student seeks an apology of a chairperson for being absent from classes
Explanation	8	53%	6	40%	
Responsibility	12	80%	13	86%	
Repair	9	60%	3	20%	
Promise of forbearance	7	46%	9	60%	

It is shown in the above table 5.1 that both groups, i.e., the SSELL and PSELL are involved in employment of different in/direct strategies wherein pragmatic transfer can be clearly seen. The most frequently used strategy in the accomplishment of speech act of apology is Illocutionary Force Initiative Device (henceforth, IFID). On average, 40% of the SSELL as compared to 60% of the PSELL have used this strategy in submitting their apologies. *PSELL5 I am sorry*. The big difference between the two participants group is that SSELL relied less on the transference of their mother tongue linguistic and cultural resources such as making an expression, *PSELL1 Unnn, Sirrrr, I am really sorry that I didn't send an application of sick leave because of serious sickness. Sir, this absence was not intentional, sooo no action kindly be taken against me. I will be very careful in future*, and *SSELL1 I am really sorry for my attitude but it was accidental not intentional. Sorry next time I will be careful*.

Moreover, the data showed that SSELL and PSELL were more indirect in making an apology from chairperson, and remained much polite in their interaction accomplished as face saving act. For example, *SSELL 6 Sir, really sorry for not taking the classes. I didn't want to skip from the classes. My doctor advised me to take complete bed rest..... that's why I was absent for the whole week. Hope my apology will be accepted at your hands*. On the other hand, PSELL were more inclined to bring cultural and linguistic resources from their mother tongue, such an expression, *PSELL 3 Yes in such situations, I will make an apology by saying that I am really sorry and it will not happen again that's why I couldn't make it well.... But I assure you that it will not happen again. Please sir*, and are incorporated into the

target language which is a clear manifestation of being very indirect and less straightforward. Following this example, it has been asserted, thus, the PSELL subjects are more indirect than SSELL in their apologies because pragmatic transfer is used as a resource to translate the idea in the target language from the native language. There is an exception in this regard with one SSELL participant who stated that, *SSELL 1 "Sorry sir" due to lack of cultural and linguistic knowledge to be displayed according to the pragmatic norms of target language.* On the other hand, another participant who remained more straightforward and less indirect stated that *SSELL 4 I am sorry for this mistake because I can't send an application. In future I will try my level best to take classes [sic].* Most SSELL and PSELL group participants have preferred indirect discourse strategies that can be pragmatically interpreted as the occurrence of transfer happens due to intervention of mother tongue social norms transferred into the pragmatics of English language.

Another obvious difference in the usage of IFID that SSELL group has firmly used in the beginning of making an apology, while the PSELL group has also used the IFID expressions in the beginning as chunks of apology. The data of this situation contended that the PSELL group has used frequently the resource of pragmatic transfer to enhance their pragmatic competence, while SSELL group has accessed a usage frequency of IFID closer to SSELL. It might be expected that the SSELL participant such as, *SSELL5 I am really sorry. I haven't done it deliberately..... You can see my doctor prescription* might not be overwhelmingly influenced by their native culture norms. Thus, the SSELL group has remained more direct as the apology from the professor has sought with less mitigation such as, *SSELL6 ummmm, I am sorry I didn't skip from classes. I was sick and the doctor advised me to take rest that's why I remained absent and sorry I will not come up with this attitude.*

Most importantly, it was asserted that SSELL and PSELL both are engaged in the use of pragmatic transfer as a resource that help them to create an ease in the learning process of L2. As a result, it doesn't keep the learner bound to develop pragmatic competence rather largely affects while learning the prevailing pragmatic norms in the target language. For example, *SSELL1 I am very sorry for the absence from the classes and please give me a chance.* It seems like they are still in a place where they don't want to develop their pragmatic competence through interlanguage. It can be said that both groups of SSELL and PSELL participants have an orientation towards native like convention of IFIDs since their conspicuous IFID expression

option was “*I am sorry*” as native speakers. Usage of providing an explanation to lessen the effect of offense was somewhat different in the two groups of participants (PSELL, 60%, SSELL, 53%). So, in order to compensate the situation immediately, the silence which prevails in PSELL group after the accomplishment of apology is taken as a sign of submissiveness, repentant of the wrong doings and above all, a sign of wholeheartedness and sincerity behind the act of apology.

It has been shown in the results displayed in the above table that PSELL group doesn't think it necessary to provide any explanation or to make an excuse rather a less straightforward and indirect apology strategy is adopted in terms of posing a repair for the offense as indicated a low frequency with 20%, while the SSELL group displayed outstanding results with 60%. For instance, the SSELL group generally used the expression such as, *SSELL4 Sir I am so sorry for not taking classes last week..... but I was suffering from serious stomach pain and.... Doctor advised me to take rest for some days. I hope you understand my situation. Sorry once again and again.....* This can be inferred as an outcome of pragmatic transfer which is used by PSELL as a resource resulting in the form of sociopragmatic transfer that badly affects their pragmatic competence in the target language. For instance, *PSELL2 Am Sir I am sorry for skipping classes. Am Actual I had been suffering from malaria due to which I couldn't attend my classes? I hope you will allow me to sit in the classes.* Most importantly, PSELL group has used the strategy of taking the responsibility more than SSELL group (SSELL 80%, and PSELL 86%). In terms of responsibility, SSELL and PSELL marked slight differences where SSELL group chosen strategy of responsibility was due to absence of intent.

Moreover, PSELL participants have used by 60% of the indirect apologies without IFID in this situation which showed their submissiveness and sincerity, for example, *PSELL3 Sir, I apologize for not attending the classes regularly because I was quite sick for last few days and was unable to send my leave application..... but..... I I can provide my medical certificate, if needed..... and I assure you for being regular now onward for classes.* As a concluding note here, it was showed that there is a high-low social distance between the interlocutors. In the PSELL culture, making an apology of a professor is considered very strict and even the participants have remained quiet immediately after their utterance of apology as it is considered a token of due respect and being polite, and above all the accomplishment of apology is then assumed a highly culturally based act meant to be accomplished wholeheartedly and

through cultural knowledge. Whereas, the data presented the SSELL group that power relationships are regarded as more flexible and can differ in their culture. It was revealed that the offence on the part of hearer can be considered as not severe.

Situation 2: This situation includes the same social distance, and power relationship like situation 1. In this situation both of the groups have used different pattern of strategies as the offender (making an apology of a professor) has the lower power status or equal in the status. The inclusive result showed that the accomplished act of speaker is neither face threatening nor offensive.

Table 5.2 Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 2 for Apology

Types of Apology Strategy	SSELL		PSELL		Contents of Situation
	Pragmatic Transfer	%	Pragmatic transfer	%	
IFID	4	26%	3	20%	A student is making an apology of a professor for being half hour late in the class
Explanation	11	73%	9	60%	
Responsibility	6	40%	4	26%	
Repair	13	86%	9	60%	
Promise of forbearance	5	33%	3	20%	

The results shown in the above table 5.2 is significant in which the SSELL group has employed by 26% which is larger than the PSELL group by 20%. Elaborating the results, the PSELL group assumed being indirect but the difference is not wide because SSELL group did the same almost while attempting indirect strategy by incorporating linguistic elements of their mother tongue. Likewise, the influence of L1 cultural knowledge creates an inability to develop pragmatic competence in the target language. Thus, it was evident that the SSELL group has used explanations more while they were apologizing. For example, *PSELL 6 Sorry for getting late but I have a documentary proof for being late (Bluntly)*, and *SSELL 1 I Am very sorry but Due to an appointment with the doctor, I got late. I promise.*

As far as the usage of repair for the offence is concerned, both the groups have employed the strategy, the SSELL used 86%, like, *SSELL4 I do admit that I usually get late in the class, for which I am really sorry but I have some serious health issues.*

SSELL 2 I am sorry because I visited doctor and because I was not feeling well. I am sorry and I will never give you a chance for complaining against me. SSELL3 Sorry, I had a meeting with doctor for an important health issue of mine. Please give me one chance. I will arrive soon next time. Only one participant from the PSELL group has used repair to enlighten the offence only by 6%. For example, *PSELL1 I am sorry sir but I had an appointment with doctor who comes once in a month. I will be well in time in future.* The promise of forbearance as a strategy was used by the participants of both the groups, the SSELL by 33% showed the lack of intent, and the PSELL by 20% which showed the increasing intensity of making an apology. Overall, the SSELL participants has used direct apology as a strategy before his professor to minimize the responsibility and come up with self-blaming. For example, *SSELL 5 I am really sorry for coming late today. I will not do so again.*

The PSELL participants were found indirect in order to minimize the offence, such as: *PSELL2 I am sorry for my carelessness.* In this situation though IFID is frequently employed by both the groups where SSELL group (26%) has attempted to use intensifiers which is same in the case of PSELL (20%) group too. In respect to repair for the offence, SSELL and PSELL participants displayed different forms of repairs. For instance, the PSELL group asserted that they would be careful next time. For example, *PSELL3 I am actually not well so I had got an appointment with the doctor. Kindly let me in this time. Sorry* while the SSELL group stated for a way to repair the offence for example, *SSELL 4 Am sorry for being late as I had an appointment with a doctor. So, I promise that I will not be late again.* The next section discusses the situation 3 for the speech act of apology.

Situation 3: In this situation, the affiliation and distance between the interlocutors is same for both the groups. The intensity and potential of the action differed culturally. In SSELL culture, in the circle of friends if something happens out of the way then it is not regarded an offence or blunder whereas in PSELL culture such habits are highly criticized and creates an atmosphere of untrustworthiness and insincerity too. For example, *PSELL1 Buddy I am really sorry. It was my fault. I should have made sure that you are holding the cup tightly. Your cloth will be fine soon, and I II will clean it with my tissue in hand.*

In this situation, the participants of both the groups equally employed all the available strategies almost with equal proportion. Below are the results obtained from the data for this situation?

**Table 5.3 Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups-
Situation 3**

Types of Apology Strategy	SSELL		PSELL		Contents of Situation
	Pragmatic Transfer	%	Pragmatic transfer	%	
IFID	7	46%	9	60%	A student seeks an apology of a chairperson for being absent from classes
Explanation	11	73%	8	53%	
Responsibility	9	60%	13	86%	
Repair	6	40%	11	73%	
Promise of forbearance	5	33%	3	20%	

Upon the analysis of the data, it was clear that the usage of IFID is very high. In the PSELL group by 60% has used IFID, such as, *PSELL 3 Ahhh so sorry. I was really excited to see you after a long time, so that's why it happened* as a part of their apologies. Secondly, the SSELL group has also used explanation as a strategy by 46% frequency. The PSELL group has also used similar to SSELL in frequency almost the same with a difference of 14% frequency. The SSELL group has preferred nonspecific explanations, for example, *SSELL 2 Oho, sorry my friend, I couldn't hold it properly but I try to clean the spot by a tissue*. Moreover, explanations as asserted are approximately same in the two groups as well, *SSELL5 Uhhh am extremely sorry dear. I feel too bad for that. I didn't know how it happened*. Regarding offering a repair for the offense, the SSELL group has used by 40% as a strategy for the repair of the offence, *PSELL 2 ooooohHHoo, I did such a shameful act my dear friend and I am sorry for that. Am sorry am sorry and, it was my mistake* which is relatively used more by the PSELL participants by 73% frequency, and SSELL group employed by 40% like, *SSELL 4 Ahhh so sorry I didn't mean to do that, it was my mistake (jerking the clothes of friend). Please don't mind, let me clean the dirty spot. SSELL 6 ohh sorry what I did what I did, I thought that, I thought that but.....*

A wide marked difference lies in taking the responsibility where PSELL has got an edge over the SSELL group because the PSELL group has used by 86% than the SSELL group by 60%. The PSELL participants were inclined to take the responsibility in order to minimize the offence, *PSELL 5 O my goodness, really feel*

sorry for that but anyhow pardon me please. Two SSELL participants even don't bother to make an apology as necessary in the situation. For example, *SSELL 5 I lost the grip over the cup and I am sorry for the drops of water fell over your clothes.* Thus, it is proved that the PSELL group revealed that an interlanguage has been utilised by relating strategies that does follow in the native speaker groups of Pashtu and Saraiki. *PSELL 6 Oho, I am so sorry for this. It wasn't intentional. Sorry again friend.* The SSELL group also used the strategy of promise of forbearance by 33% frequency. *SSELL 3 Ah, sorry my dear friend. I might be apologized for this unintentional act.* It is inferred from the data that the participants of both groups were found using direct strategy of making an apology of an old friend. Thus, the approval of responsibility would be regarded by hearer (henceforth, H) as an apology, while rejection of responsibility would be perceived as speaker's (henceforth, S) rejection of the need to apologize. To sum up the above discussion, it is asserted from the results that the PSELL participants were more indirect in this situation as compared with the SSELL group participant. It showed that the PSELL participants have considered it as more severe offence even in the circle of friends who are holding the same status.

5.2 Speech Act: Request

Situation 1: In this situation, the status of the interlocutor is equal. A friend is requesting another friend to fix the issue that has occurred to laptop. As the below table shows that both the groups have almost used a range of request strategies, and displayed, overall, the same results during the accomplishment of request as a speech act. As mentioned earlier that extending cooperation is a trait mutually shared by the members of the PSELL speech community which has not been observed among the SSELL participants. The below table 5.4 illustrates the results in percentages for the speech act of request.

Furthermore, both the groups i-e, the SSELL (33%), and the PSELL only (16%) which shows less inclination to the use of imperative and has seldom used as a strategy. An example of an imperative request from PSELL group as *PSELL 6 Hello my friend, I want you to please fix the problem of my laptop.* In other example from SSELL group, such as: *SSELL 6 Dear I need your help because my laptop is not working. Would you please help me?* The use of alerters such as "Dear friend", "dear fellow" is almost used as a strategy by both the groups simultaneously to get the attention of the hearer as to let him know about the urgency behind the request. These

alerters or attention getters are used with an equal proportion by both the groups to intensify the interest of the hearer that what the speaker wants him to do, for example, *SSELL 4 Hello I need a favour from you.*

Table 5.4 Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 1 for Request

Strategy of Requests	Tokens/Definitions	SSELL		PSELL		Contents of Situation
		Pragmatic transfer	%	Pragmatic transfer	%	
Direct	Imperative	2	33%	1	16%	A friend is making request to fix the problem occurred to laptop
	Explicit performative	-	-	-	-	
	Hedged Performative	3	50%	2	33%	
	Goal statement	2	33%	3	50%	
	Want statement	1	16%	1	16%	
Conventionally Indirect (CI)	Ability or permission	1	16%	2	33%	
	Availability	5	83%	4	66%	
Non-Conventionally Indirect (NCI)	Question Hint	3	50%	2	33%	
	Statement Hint	1	16%	2	33%	

The second most direct sub-strategy which is not used by the participants of both the groups, is the use of explicit performative request wherein the speaker names the illocutionary intent explicitly, with a relevant illocutionary verb. In the use of this feature of hedged performative for request, the SSELL group has used it as a device 3 times by 50%, and the PSELL group has used it 2 times by 33% which showed that the emphasis is particularly made in order to develop a force at the hearers' end for compliance of the act. The use of these performative verbs is done with an intention to produce a polite effect as Quinn (1996a, p. 61) observes. Thus, such request form probably conveys more politeness, for example, *PSELL1 Buddy I urgently need your help. Would you please spare some time to help me out in fixing the problem of my laptop? Thank you very much*, which provides a fairly accurate notion of the degree of politeness conveyed by adopting an indirect strategy.

In the direct sub-strategy of 'hedged performative', both the groups have not used any performative verb that is modified by a modal verb, such as, *SSELL2 Dear my laptop is out of order since last two days. Please help me.* In this example, there is no use of modal verb rather shows an imposition upon hearer to comply with request

by all means. In this connection, the SSELL group have used hedged performative for 3 times with 50%, and the PSELL group have used it for 2 times with the percentage of 33%. In the fourth direct sub-strategy, the goal statement, the participants of the PSELL group employed it by 33%, and the SSELL group stands by 50%. This strategy of Goal statement conveys certain optimism that the requestee will comply with the request, and in this way conveys a degree of positive politeness. For example, *PSELL3 Dear can you please fix the problem of my laptop as I have to work on important assignment today. I will be very much thankful to you for your help.* Whereas, *SSELL6 buddy I need your help in fixing a problem in my laptop. Could you please fix the problem?* *PSELL 2 Can you do me a favour?* Following this example, the speaker states his or her longing for the objective of the request meant to be carried out, using a relevant modal verb. The force of Want statements has used by SSELL group by 16% and the PSELL group has used it almost equal by 16%. For example, *PSELL5 Dear can you please fix the problem of my laptop as I have to work on important assignment today. I will be very much thankful to you for your help.*

Moreover, want statements are considered as imposition in PSELL culture and are less inappropriate because it is very common among their communities that it keeps the hearer bound to comply with the request of the speaker by all means, while it is considered more appropriate among SSELL group as their culture allows them to become flexible and leave a social distance and preference is given to use of want statements. *SSELLL12, I have to write an assignment but my computer is not working. All that you have to do is to fix the problem, if it is possible, unless you have to give me some time for repairing it.* *SSELLL8 buddy I need your help in fixing a problem in my laptop. Could you please fix the problem?* In ability or permission requests, the speaker asks about a condition necessary for the request to be fulfilled. This strategy is used by the participants of the study by 16% by SSELL group and the PSELL group has used it by 33% as a strategy twice bigger than the other group. Requests for permission using the modal verb can legitimately be regarded as questions about the hearer's approval, and hence, place the speaker more clearly in a subordinate position to the hearer. For example, *SSELL4 buddy I need your help in fixing a problem in my laptop. Could you please fix it in my laptop?*

Another query preparatory sub-strategy is one in which the speaker questions the condition whether the desired goods are available, using the verb, "there is/ there are" or the verb, "have". Examples of query preparatory availability requests are

these: *PSELL2 Hello, I am in dire need of your assistance. My laptop has got an issue due to which it doesn't work.* This strategy is almost used frequently by both the groups in making a request by 83% by the SSELL group, and by 66% by the PSELL group relatively lesser than the other group. In this way the utterance made by the participants achieves the status of a request proper and a deeper attention is paid to what is being meant by the speaker? For example, *SSELL6 Dear friend, I know you are so busy in your own work. I am facing a problem where I need your urgent help. So, if you can spare some time and please solve my problem.*

The Head Act of a request may vary in strategy type. Request strategies have different levels of directness; that is, they differ in the length of the inferential pathway which the hearer must follow in order to attribute requestive intent to the utterance (Blum-Kulka et al 1989). The degree of indirectness of a request is related to its politeness, although the two dimensions do not have a simple parallel correspondence (cf. Blum-Kulka 1987), and the relation between the two dimensions may be culture- and language- specific (Wierzbicka 1991). Non-conventionally indirect requests (hints), illustrated in table 5.4 shows that two sub-strategies have used by the participants of SSELL by 50% and PSELL group by 33 %, can be classified as non-conventionally indirect requests, or hints. Hints are indirect question forms which cannot be modified in the language, and therefore, require more inferencing action for the hearer to infer the speaker's determination behind the request. For instance, *SSELL4 Hello I need a favour from you. I have to submit an assignment tomorrow and my laptop is not working properly. If you don't mind, would you please solve my problem? It is very urgent too.* It is pertinent to mention here the CCSARP taxonomy of request strategies (Blum-Kulka et al 1989; CCSARP 1989), hints are sub-classified as "strong" or "mild". This discrepancy between strong and slight hints appears to rest on the aspect of propositional transparency. For example, *PSELL4 Hey I have to submit an assignment within due time but I had a problem in my laptop, if you could help me to fix the problem?* As a result, statement hints, like question hints, are heavily dependent on context for their requestive force. Examples of statement hints as such: *SSELL2 buddy I need your help in fixing a problem in my laptop. Could you please fix it in my laptop?*

In the above, highly context-specific features (e.g., that the requestee got a problem in his computer and he has something urgent to do, besides, seeking the help in the form of a request to fix him the problem occurred to computer. The hearer,

thus, infer that the requestee wants either to take his laptop for some days or the problem occurred to laptop might be fixed. As a matter of fact, it is the hearer who feels embarrassment in making a request and overlooks naming the receiver as the principal performer of the act renders to mitigate upon the degree of the imposition. For example, *PSELL 6 Dear, could you please fix this issue?* Moreover, the effect of the both groups' native language and culture was displayed through the manifestation of sociopragmatic transfer. Such pragmatic failure has been shown mainly happens due to the subjects' misunderstanding and less consideration towards their social status and distance with others and the extent of imposition of their requests.

The results of the study showed that sociopragmatic transfer is evident in the participants' manipulation of the mother tongue strategies that always push others to collaborate with compliance of their requests. Moreover, showing inclination to help others is an attribute that is highly praised in the selected speech communities of the understudy. For example, through the overemphasis of the exertion the speaker will overcome as a concern of the hearer's amenability with a request. In such utterances, for example, *PSELL 6 Dear, could you please fix this issue*, where genuineness is not overrepresented and the hearer's compliance is depicted as urgently needed to put the requester at ease. The strategy has been used to put density on the hearer and to intensify his/her empathy with the speaker's desires. For instance, *SSELL 3 my dear friend, please give me your laptop*.

To sum up the above results, it can be asserted that using the same request strategies with senior members varies, and it is perceived as an assault on face or blunder because it suggests that the speaker has social and cultural power over the listener. Thus, participants exploited the sociopragmatic norms of their native culture that are integrated into English language. On average the results indicated that the performance of the students was affected by their mother tongue and native culture resources embedded into the target language. Furthermore, the data on this situation bears several instances to the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer as the participants are using sociopragmatic norms of the SSELL and PSELL group language and culture when articulate the speech act in English. In this regard, the data displayed that the participants' used the sociopragmatic norms of their mother tongue and native culture in their responses in English language that stemmed in expressions and configurations that are aberrant from the social norms of the target language.

Situation 2: In this situation, the requestee has got admission in a university and has missed a few lectures delivered earlier by his/her teacher. Now, the requestee is seeking help of a classmate whom he doesn't know longer or before, and put forward a request to get some notes or hints about the missing lectures. The most direct sub-strategy which is used almost with equal proportion by the participants of both the groups, is the use of explicit performative request wherein the speaker names the illocutionary intent explicitly, with a relevant illocutionary verb, such as, *SSELLL3 Kindly give me your notes. Can you please share your written notes with me?* The emphasis is particularly made in order to develop a force at the hearers' end for compliance of the act. In short, it was observed that the PSELL group participants relied more on the linguistic and cultural conventions of mother tongue as compared with the SSELL group.

The below-given table presents the occurrence of pragmatic transfer in percentages of situation 2 for the speech act of request.

Table 5.5 Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 2 for Request

Strategy of Requests	Tokens/Definitions	SSELL		PSELL		Theme of situation
		Pragmatic transfer	%	Pragmatic transfer	%	
Direct	Imperative	-	-	-	16%	Requesting for borrowing notes from a new intimate
	Explicit performative	2	33%	3	50%	
	Hedged Performative	1	16%	-	-	
	Goal statement	2	33%	3	50%	
	Want statement	3	50%	4	66%	
Conventionally Indirect (CI)	Ability or permission	3	50%	5	83%	
	Availability	5	83%	3	50%	
Non-Conventionally Indirect (NCI)	Question Hint	5	83%	4	66%	
	Statement Hint	4	66%	2	33%	

In this second situation, the use of alerters such as “Dear friend”, “dear fellow” is almost used as a strategy by both the groups simultaneously to get the attention of the hearer as to let him know about the significance of the request. These alerters and attention getters are used with an equal proportion by both the groups to increase the curiosity of the hearer that what the speaker wants him to do. Examples of alerters

are, like, *PSELL 5 excuse me. Can I have your notes taking register please because I missed few earlier lectures? I make sure the safe return of your register. SSELL 3 excuse me dear, would you please give me some notes on the previous lectures?* Moreover, the social distance and status of the interlocutors is same. The result shows that participants have employed much politeness in their request to persuade the hearer as what the requestee wants him to do. In this regard, different strategies are carried out to bind the requester with the compliance of the forwarded act.

In the direct sub-strategy of ‘hedged performative’, the PSELL group has used more performative verbs by 50%. For example, *PSELL 5 hello dear, please would you like to share with me the notes of previous lectures?* The use of these performative verbs is done with an intention to produce a polite effect as Quinn (1996) observes. Thus, such request form probably conveys more politeness, for example, *PSELL 6 I am in a dire need of your help. Please help me.* Following this example, *please help me* then creates a hedge on the illocutionary force of the performative verb which makes the request less direct than the explicit performative strategy. In the next direct sub-strategy, the Goal statement, the participants of both the groups have stated the strategy of state of affairs, or goal, of the request, and the SSELL group stands by 33%, whereas 50% by the participants of PSELL which is used almost equally. This strategy of Goal statement conveys certain optimism that the requestee will comply with the request, and in this way conveys a degree of positive politeness. For instance, *PSELL 2 Dear, I have missed few lectures. Please help me in this regard, PSELL 5 please will you give me your previous lectures notes? Will you help me?* Following this example, the speaker expresses his or her intent of request to indicate the urgency and goal as an indirect strategy by employing a relevant modal verb.

The force of Want statements as a strategy have used by SSELL group by 50%, and the PSELL group by 66% comparatively with a minor different proportion, and showed preferences to develop a want statement to avoid any imposition at the end of the hearer. Moreover, want statements are considered as imposition on hearer meant to be complied the forwarded request becomes mandatory in PSELL culture and are less inappropriate because it is very common among their communities that it keeps the hearer bound to comply with the request of the speaker by all means, while it is considered more appropriate among SSELL group as their culture allows them to become flexible and leave a social distance and preference is given to use of want statements. For example, *SSELL 1 would like you to give me the notes on the lectures*

I have missed? In ability or permission requests, the data revealed that both the group fairly opted for the use of a modal verb to emphasize the force and urgency of the matter. The most common strategy used both by Pashtu and Saraiki speakers was the preparatory one, like *PSELL 5 could you please provide me notes*, and PSELL group used it slightly more often by 83% than SSELL subjects by 50%, although the differences stand significant. It is inferred from the results of this situation that different situations do not seem to have an important effect on the use of the preparatory strategy. For instance, *PSELL 6 I am in a dire need of your help. Please help me*. The differences related to other strategies (mood derivable hints and want statements) were only marginal.

Another conventionally indirect sub-strategy is one in which the speaker questions the condition that goods are available, using the verb. For example, *SSELL 6 hi, please give me notes on lectures I have missed. SSELL 7 my dear fellow, actually I was ill. Please give me notes*. Non-conventionally indirect requests (hints), illustrated in table 5.3 above shows that two sub-strategies used by subjects of SSELL by 83% and PSELL by 66%, which can be classified as non-conventionally indirect requests, or hints. For example, *PSELL 3 Hello, I am new here. Can you please help me with some notes? PSELL 4 hello friend, actually I really want your help. Will you lend me your notes?* A question hint is an enquiring expression which functions as a request and that cannot be regarded as a conventional form of request. As question hints do not convey requestive force by virtue of their formal properties, their requestive force is heavily dependent on context. Both the SSELL group and the PSELL group speakers used modal verbs in this situation which are more used by PSELL group, such as *PSELL 6 Can you please provide me with the notes on missing lectures? PSELL 1 would you please provide me with the lectures I missed*. The PSELL group have used the word please as a politeness marker with an intention to produce an effect and conveys broader meanings at the end of the hearer, like, *PSELL 1 Hello, how are you? Would you like to share your notes with me? PSELL 4 I was busy in some other activities and I missed a few lectures. So, will you please give me your notes?*

Much alerters have been used in the case of apologies by both the groups. The SSELL and PSELL both the groups' speakers also tended to use the addressee's attention. For example, *PSELL 5 hello dear, please would you like to share with me the notes of previous lectures? PSELL2 my dear fellow! Please, help me about the*

previous lectures I missed. The use of alerters is also related to context and both groups use more alerters in the first and second and less alerters in the third situation. *I will be thankful to you. PSELL 1 hello friend, I was absent and missed a few lectures. Would you please help me? PSELL 3 hi do you have notes on the previous lectures? Can you share them with me?* The occurrence of pragmatic failure is shown due to the misperception of the participants of social relative distance in terms of the degree of imposition of the request, for instance, *SSELL 3 please can you help me about previous lectures? SSELL 5 hello dear, how are you? Glad to meet you. Would you please share your notes with me? I will appreciate that.* The overall results showed that the presentation of the participants is inspired by their mother tongue linguistic and the social norms of the native culture. The results, further traced several scenarios of pragmatic transfer as the participants exploited the sociopragmatic norms by the SSELL and PSELL group through the help of their own language and culture when responding in English. The above results testify the strategies adopted for pragmatic transfer resulted in the contents of the utterance of the speech act that are divergent from the well-established social norms of the target language.

Situation 3: In this situation, a student is requesting his friends to be quiet, who are making noise as the requester was unable to concentrate on his reading a book in the library which is not a public place.

In this situation, like the other, the use of alerters such as “Dear friend”, “dear fellow” is almost used as a strategy by both the groups simultaneously to get the attention of the hearer as to let him know about the significance of the request. These alerters and attention getters are used with an equal proportion by both the groups to increase the curiosity of the hearer that what the speaker wants him to do. A participant uttered these words, *PSELL 5 excuse me friends, it's a library and I am reading but because of your noise, I can't concentrate on my study. So, please would you like shut up your mouths?* The hearer, thus, infer that the requestee wants either to be quiet in the library or leave the library. For example, *SSELL 6 excuse me, please. Can you people be quiet for some time as I have some important work to finish?* The emphasis is particularly made in order to develop a force at the hearers' end for compliance of the act. In the direct sub-strategy of ‘hedged performative’, the SSELL group has used more performative verbs that are modified by a modal verb, such as, *SSELL 3 hi friends, here we come to read books but you are continuously talking which makes it very hard for me to concentrate.* The second of these verbs, conveys

much greater formality, and also suggests that the requestee is in equal status of authority with respect to the requester. Thus, such request form probably conveys more politeness, for example, *PSELL 3 would you like to stop making noise? PSELL 6 please don't make noise!* Likewise, it provides a fairly accurate notion of the degree of politeness found among both the groups, which is conveyed by adopting an indirect strategy. For example, *PSELL 1 will you please keep quiet? SSELL 2 would you please stop making noise?* In this example, the modal verb, would you like then creates a hedge on the illocutionary force of the performative verb which makes the request less direct than the explicit performative strategy. *PSELL 4 excuse me, can you please lower your voice? PSELL 5 excuse me, will you please remain quiet?*

Table 5.6 Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 3 for Request

Strategy of Requests	Tokens/Definitions	SSELL		PSELL		Contents of situation
		Pragmatic transfer	%	Pragmatic transfer	%	
Direct	Imperative	3	50%	5	83%	Requesting a group friends to be quiet in the library
	Explicit performative	5	83%	3	50%	
	Hedged Performative	4	66%	4	66%	
	Goal statement	4	66%	5	83%	
	Want statement	3	50%	2	33%	
Conventionally Indirect (CI)	Ability or permission	1	16%	3	50%	
	Availability	-	-	-	-	
Non-Conventionally Indirect (NCI)	Question Hint	2	33%	4	66%	
	Statement Hint	3	50%	3	50%	

In the fourth direct sub-strategy, the Goal statement, the participants of both the groups have anticipated the strategy of the desired state of affairs, or goal, of the request, and the SSELL group stands by 66%, whereas 83% by the participants of PSELL which is used in different ways. For example, *PSELL 1 my friends, exam is going on, would you like to stop your noise*, this strategy of Goal statement conveys a certain optimism that the requestee will comply with the request, and in this way conveys a degree of positive politeness. For instance, *SSELL 6 hello listen! Can you be quiet? We have to be quiet while in library because it is not a public place. PSELL 2 hi do you people know that this is a library and you are supposed to be quiet and do*

not make noise. Following this example, the speaker states his or her desire for the goal of the request to be realised, using a relevant modal verb. *SSELL 4 Excuse, would you like to stop making noise?* The force of want statements is used by SSELL group by 50%, and the PSELL group by 33%, and prioritizes to develop a want statement to avoid any imposition on the hearer. Moreover, want statements are considered as imposition on hearer as to accomplish the forwarded request becomes mandatory in PSELL culture and are less inappropriate because it is very common among their communities that it keeps the hearer bound to comply the request of the speaker by all means, while it is considered more appropriate among SSELL group as their culture allows them to become flexible and leave a social distance and preference is given to use of want statements. For example, *SSELL 5 Dear fellows, as we know that we are all students, and we have to help one another in the right manner. Please observe silence because other students are getting disturbed due to this act.*

In the indirect strategies of requests, the SSELL participants employed 16%, and the PSELL participants 50% which is quite higher than the other group, wherein speaker asks about a condition necessary for the request to be fulfilled. The data revealed that both the group fairly opted for the use of a modal verb to emphasize the force and urgency of the matter. The most common strategy used both by Pashtu and Saraiki speakers was the preparatory, *PSELL5 can you? Guys! Can you keep quiet? SSELL 6 could you please be quiet?* In this form of request, the speaker asks about a condition necessary for the request to be fulfilled. The data revealed that both the group fairly opted for the use of a modal verb to emphasize the force and urgency of the matter. It is inferred from the results of this situation that different situations do not seem to have important effects on the use of the preparatory strategy. *SSELL 1 hey! Sorry but I am trying to focus on my study. Would you please keep your voices a little low? Thanks.* Requests for permission using the modal verb can legitimately be regarded as questions about the hearer's permission seems to convey this sense more overtly, and hence, place the speaker more clearly in a subordinate position to the hearer. For example, *SSELL 3 hey! Please keep this thing in your mind that you people are sitting in the library, you are supposed to be quiet, so kindly be quiet.* Therefore, rather than being grouped together with other question hints, this type of request has been classified as a separate conventional strategy. *PSELL 3 excuse me, if you don't mind, please stop talking. It is a rule to keep silence in library.*

A question hint that is an interrogative utterance which functions as a request, but which is not conventionalised as a request forms (unlike interrogative forms such as B “Can I?” or “May I?” which are so conventionalised). *SSELL 5 please, be silent!* *SSELL 3 Please! Don't make a noise. SSELL 5 please be quiet. I cannot concentrate on my studies.* As question hints do not convey requestive force by virtue of their formal properties; their requestive force is heavily dependent on context. Examples of question hints are, like, *SSELL 5 hello buddies. Please don't make a noise here.* *PSELL 2 excuse me students, you are sitting in the library. Would you please keep quiet?* *PSELL 5 sweet friends don't make noise because I am reading a book.* Although many alterters are used in the case of apologies by both the groups, The SSELL and PSELL both the groups' speakers also tended to get the addressee's attention. For example, *SSELL 4 brothers, what are you people doing?* *SSELL 5 my dear friends, please keep quiet.* *PSELL 4 hey friends, will you please stop disturbing me?*

Most importantly, the results shown and obtained the data demonstrates that pragmatic transfer was used as a resource to accomplish different communicative acts resulting in the integration of the mother tongue linguistic and social norms which are incorporated in to English. Further, the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer is seen in the kind of sociopragmatic transfer based on the misperception of the non-native speakers of English in terms of social status and distance with others and the extent of imposition of their requests, for instance, *PSELL 3 due to your noise, i am not able to concentrate. I request you to be quiet.* Using a language for communicative purposes with senior members are considered as an insult in the PSELL group because it entails that the speaker has social power over the listener. The participants of both groups were inclined to exploit the sociopragmatic norms of their native culture when they employed different strategies on different occasions in their responses to the English oral role play.

The results displayed in the above table showed that the presentation of the participant is influenced by their mother tongue linguistic and native culture social norms which are tangled in the target language. However, it has shown several occasions of pragmatic transfer as the participants of both groups were inclined to use the sociopragmatic norms of their respective mother tongues and native culture when realizing the speech act in English. Thus, the type of pragmatic transfer i.e., sociopragmatic transfer occurs in the participants' performance due to intervention of

sociocultural norms of the mother tongue and native culture appears in the responses to the English oral open role play that resulted in their expressions that are unusual from the rules of the target language.

5.3 Speech Act: Refusal

Situation 1: In this situation, students have decided to invite a professor (whom approval or acceptance of supervision during the event is pre-requisite) to join them on the occasion. As a result, the professor refuses the invitation by employing different strategies. The refusal strategies employed by the SSELL and PSELL group overall. The below-given table shows usage frequency of the main refusal strategies utilized by the two groups.

As the result shows that both speakers of Pashtu English and Saraiki learners of English have employed 12 different strategies. Pashtu speakers have used a total of 10 strategies, whereas the SSELL group has employed a total of 12. Most important to mention that in this situation the status and social relation of the interlocutors is different. In PSELL culture it is taken a highly sensitive act to refuse the request, but in the SSELL group a social distance is followed though the request might not be entertained. It shows that different strategies were employed and pragmatic transfer was used as a resource to accomplish the speech act of refusal wherein mother tongue cultural and social resources are integrated in English.

The strategy of providing reason/explanation for refusals was the most employed strategy by both groups overall; the PSELL group has used this strategy by 50% of the 3 time, while the SSELL group has utilized it by 83%. For example, *SSELL 2 I will surely join you but I am busy with some work, and PSELL 4 my dear students, I really want to join you but I cannot go due to my busy schedule. PSELL 5 I am sorry because I have to attend a marriage ceremony of my very close friend.* The second less used strategy was the direct refusal realized by negative ability (e.g., I can't). Even though Pashtu speakers seem to prefer to use this strategy with a higher frequency (33%), the PSELL group has also used this strategy as their second preferred by 16%. *PSELL 2 I wish but I cannot join you.* Another difference worthwhile to mention is that both the groups expressed refusals with almost same proportion of using regret as an indirect strategy by 33%, employed both groups. For instance, *SSELL 6 I am sorry. I am already engaged. SSELL 3 sorry students I am busy.* The SSELL group utilized hedge by 16%, whereas PSELL group has not used

the strategy of hedge in its utterances at all. In addition to these strategies, both groups used adjuncts to mitigate their refusals, which are remarks that could not stand alone to function as a refusal, e.g., *PSELL 1 i would like to go with you but I am too busy these days*. Both groups employed positive opinion but SSELL group stands significant by 83%, and PSELL participants by 50%.

Table 5.7 Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 1

Strategies of Refusal	Categories	SSELL		PSELL		Contents of situation
		Pragmatic transfer	%	Pragmatic transfer	%	
Direct refusal	Using performative verbs	1	16%	2	33%	A professor is refusing an invitation of students for trip.
	Non performative statement	-	-	-	-	
Indirect refusals	Regret	2	33%	2	33%	
	Wish	4	66%	2	33%	
	Reason, explanation	5	83%	3	50%	
	Alternatives	1	16%	-	-	
	Promise of acceptance	-	-	2	33%	
	Acceptance as a refusal	4	66%	5	%	
	Avoidance	1	16%	3	50%	
	Positive opinion	5	83%	3	50%	
	Empathy	-	-	1	16%	
	Pause fillers	1	16%	1	16%	
Gratitude/appreciation	5	83%	3	50%		

Another use of strategy is gratitude which has been used and the same results of positive opinion are displayed of 83% by SSELL and 50% by PSELL. Only pause fillers are used with equal proportion by 16% each group for the purpose to mitigate their refusals, but the adjunct of willingness was only used by the PSELL group with a higher frequency by 33%, wherein the SSELL group has not employed this strategy, such as *PSELL 3 I would like to go with you but I am busy these days*. Among the three types of adjuncts used by both groups, the most utilized was positive opinion, though it seems to be more preferred by SSELL participants (83%) compared to Pashtu speakers (50%). Similarly, pause fillers as a strategy have employed with equal frequency, for instance, *PSELL 4 oh so sorry dear students, I have to attend some important meetings these days due to that I cannot join you*. Moreover, Head

acts represent the minimal unit in the sequence that communicates refusals. Head acts can be either realized as direct, *PSELL 1 No I cannot join you*, or indirect, e.g., *SSELL 6 sorry to say that I have not joined you because I have to take exams. SSELL 3 my dear students, I wish to go with you people on a trip but as you know that I have an exam next week.*

The data in this study reported three different types of strategies that were used as head acts. Negative ability, e.g., *PSELL 1 No I cannot join you*, and *SSELL 5 sorry I wouldn't be able to join you* was categorized as direct, whereas reason/explanation and postponement, *PSELL 3 excuse me this time. I will join you on next trip* are coded as indirect. A considerable number of PSELL participants who commented on their preference to state the reason in their refusals might imply that their production of refusals was influenced by native cultural norms. Pre-refusals are composed of one or more strategies that initiate the sequence and prepare the hearer for the upcoming refusal. *SSELL 4 sorry dear, you know about my job and I have also some work in my home. So, please don't get angry with me.*

Moreover, the other frequent strategy of pre-refusals not only starts negotiation of refusals, but also externally modifies the head act within the refusal sequence. *PSELL 6 thank you so much for this invitation but I cannot join you on the trip*, the use of particular type of pre-refusal varied between two groups. *SSELL 3 I have a strict schedule these days. I can't join you.* The most common pre-refusal employed to initiate the negotiation for both groups was positive opinion. The PSELL group data revealed that 50% of the L2 learners preferred to use positive opinion to modify their head acts, which was also a routine utilized by the SSELL participants at a larger rate in the data (83%). According to Table 5.7, the PSELL group preferred to use regret by 33%, *PSELL 2 thanks, but I am a bit busy so, I wouldn't be able to supervise you. PSELL 3 my dear students, I have a desire to go with you on this trip but sorry. SSELL 3 sorry dear students, I have an important work at home, and SSELL 2 I am having a busy schedule. I cannot manage it. SSELL 6 sorry dear students, I have a serious work at home.*

On the other hand, the SSELL participants favored reason/explanation more (83%) to mitigate their refusals, in comparison to Pashtu learners of English (50%). Another point that is reflected in the table is that 16 % of the SSELL participants employed alternatives. *SSELL 1 I am having a very busy schedule this week. Sorry, we can arrange it next week.* The most preferred post-refusal strategy for Pashtu and

Saraiki learners of English was regret used equally by 33%, while Saraiki learners of English have used reason/explanation to mitigate main refusals with the highest frequency (83%), as illustrated, *PSELL 3 sorry because I have many things to do. PSELL 2 I am sorry I have to take an exam.* The participants of the study expressed various explanations when they refused the invitation. Accordingly, pragmatic transfer can occur not only in preference of strategies and sequential organization of refusals, but also in the content of strategies. *SSELL 5 I have some reasons that's why I couldn't come.* Since the reason/explanation was the most preferred refusal strategy by both groups overall, the content of this strategy was analyzed in order to explore what type(s) of explanations were considered appropriate and the differences between Pashtu learners of English and Saraiki learners of English are worth significant. For example, *SSELL 1 I am sorry but I am unable to go with you on trip because of my busy schedule. Enjoy your trip PSELL 7 I am sorry. I am already engaged.*

An intriguing point that was found in the data was that none of the PSELL and SSELL participants chose to provide any condition for neither acceptance nor the strategy of statement of principle and statement of philosophy in their refusals. However, this was not the case with PSELL group; who has employed the strategy of promise of acceptance by 33%. For example, *PSELL 4 I am very busy and wouldn't manage to supervise you. SSELL 4 thanks, but I am busy. So, I wouldn't be able to supervise you.* Initiating the refusal sequence for the first episode, the learner employed multiple strategies such as gratitude, future possibility etc., in addition to providing reason/explanation. Utilized as the refusal, the participants sometime expressed the reason twice in the first episode, but the reason was not specifically explained. The SSELL participants began the refusal sequence with stating positive opinion, then expressed the reason without specifying any details. Thus, the results showed that certain indirect strategies are developed to mitigate upon the speech act of refusal to avoid the offence of the interlocutor.

Situation 2: In this situation, the interlocutors are sharing equal status and have been serving as colleagues at workplace. The interaction takes place between two friends who have been working together in a reputable salon since long. One of the friends forward a request to his colleague or working mate to bring a cup of tea, and at same time, his friend is busy in sweeping the salon floor. In this situation he refuses the request forwarded by his friend. The below table illustrates the results in percentages, which indicates the occasions on which pragmatic transfer has been used as a resource

for accomplishing different communicative tasks. Thus, applying these different strategies, the pragmatic competence of the selected English learners is affected which happens due to their reliance upon mother tongue resources transferred into the target language. Both Pashtu and Saraiki learners of English employed 11 different strategies. Pashtu speakers used a total of 83% strategies through the provision of reason/explanation for refusals was the most employed strategy, whereas the SSELL group employed a total of 49% which is lesser used in frequency than the other groups overall; For example, *PSELL3 Ok. But first let me sweep the floor. SSELL4 Sorry but I have to finish my work.*

Table 5.8 Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 2 for Refusal

Strategies of Refusal	Categories	SSELL		PSELL		Contents of Situation
		Pragmatic transfer	%	Pragmatic transfer	%	
Direct refusal	Using performative verbs	4	66%	2	33%	Refusing the request of a friend in salon
	Non performative statement	-	-	-	-	
Indirect refusals	Regret	4	66%	2	33%	
	Wish	1	16%	3	49%	
	Reason, explanation	3	49%	5	83%	
	Alternatives	1	16%	2	33%	
	Attempt to dissuade	4	66%	1	16%	
	Acceptance as a refusal	3	49%	2	33%	
	Avoidance	3	49%	3	49%	
	Positive opinion	2	33%	3	49%	
	Pause fillers	2	33%	2	33%	
Gratitude/appreciation	2	33%	4	66%		

The result showed that the participants have relied more on the cultural resources of mother tongue that created an ease to accomplish the speech act appropriately and according to the established social norms of the target language. Moreover, it shows that the occurrence of pragmatic transfer either creates an ease or a difficulty for learners of second language. Thus, pragmatic transfer is used as a resource to accomplish different communicative tasks that enable them to comprehend the knowledge of TL via mother tongue. Therefore, the result contends that the speaker doesn't want to accomplish a face threatening act as the cultural

norms of both the groups don't allow its speaker to come up with a direct refusal instead indirect refusal strategies are preferred.

The second most frequently used strategy of SSELL group by 66% was the direct refusal realized by using performative verbs negative ability, e.g. *PSELL1 Guys I am sorry. I have to finish my work so I can't help you.* Even though Pashtu speakers seem to prefer to use this strategy with a frequency 33%, the SSELL group also used this strategy by 66%, twice bigger than the other group. Another difference worthwhile to mention is that both the groups expressed refusals using regret, the SSELL group used it by 66%, which is relatively more than the PSELL group who used regret by 33%. *SSELL 5 No, and a big no because I can't as I am sweeping the saloon floor.* In addition to these strategies, both groups have used adjuncts to mitigate their refusals; both groups have used positive opinion as a strategy to mitigate their refusals that has only used by the PSELL group with a high frequency by 49% than the SSELL group by 33%. For instance, *PSELL5 Yeah, my pleasure. I would be rather happy to help you but unfortunately, I am sweeping the floor, I am extremely sorry.* Among these types of adjuncts used by both groups, the most utilized was positive opinion though it seems to be more preferred by PSELL participants (49%) compared to Saraiki speakers (33%). Pause fillers, however, were utilized almost with the same proportion by (33%). The PSELL participants employed the strategy of gratitude and appreciation by 66% was used more than SSELL group by 33%. Such as, *SSELL6 I can't fetch a cup of coffee for you because I am sweeping the floor.* Whereas the strategy of reason/explanation have used more by PSELL group by 83%, that was coded as indirect. *PSELL2 I am sorry because I am already doing my job assigned to me by my boss.* According to the percentages, the PSELL group predominantly preferred the indirect strategies over direct ones.

On the other hand, the SSELL group has used direct strategies more, even though most of them utilized indirect strategies as well. Even though the inclination to state the reason instead of declining the invitation directly might result from individual characteristics, a considerable number of PSELL participants who augmented their preference to state the reason in their refusals might imply that their production of refusals was influenced by native cultural norms. Pre-refusals are composed of one or more strategies that initiate the sequence and prepare the hearer for the upcoming refusal. Table 5.8 shows the frequency and percentage of pre-refusal strategies utilized by both groups. Pre-refusals not only start negotiation of refusals,

but also externally modify the head act within the refusal sequence. *PSELL4 If you don't mind, I am really busy and I can't bring coffee for her.* According to the data, even though the total number of pre-refusals employed by both groups was the same, the use of particular type of pre-refusal varied between two groups. The most common pre-refusal employed to initiate the negotiation for both groups was positive opinion. For example, *SSELL5 I am really sorry I can't because I have to clean the floor.* The PSELL group data revealed that 49% of the L2 learners preferred to use positive opinion to modify their head acts, which was also a routine utilized by the SSELL participants at a different rate in the data (33%). The SSELL group preferred to use regret by 66%, which is twice as much as those used by Pashtu speakers (33%). On the other hand, the PSELL participants favored reason/explanation more (83%) to mitigate their refusals, in comparison to Saraiki learners of English (49%). Another point that is reflected in the table is that none of the participants from each group employ five strategies at all.

Reason/explanation was the most frequently used refusal strategy by both groups; participants of the study expressed various explanations when they refused the request. According to Beebe et al. (1990), pragmatic transfer can occur not only in preference of strategies and sequential organization of refusals, but also in the content of strategies. Since the reason/explanation was the most preferred refusal strategy by both groups overall, the content of this strategy was analyzed in order to explore what type(s) of explanations were considered appropriate and the differences between Pashtu learners of English and Saraiki learners of English and stand significant in most respects. *PSELL6 You can see I am sweeping the floor and my hands are also not clean.* Another noteworthy point in this situation was the switch from an indirect head act in the first episode to a direct head act in the second episode upon insistence. The SSELL participants were not able to mitigate the direct refusal with detailed explanations to save the interlocutor's positive face, and emphasized the illocutionary force of the refusal to prevent further insistence, which posed a threat to negative face at the hearers' end. For example, *SSELL 5 Sorry I can't give you coffee as you can see, I am already at work.*

The most frequent choice of indirect refusal found in the present study is giving reasons and explanations. Further, the content of reasons also varied which really reflected the speakers' culture. Once, the reason was sincere as seen in the refusal of Pashtu participants. One direct strategy chosen by all research participants,

whether to their equal status interlocutors or higher status interlocutors, was using performative verbs. The absence of performing direct strategy by only using performative verbs indicates that all participants seemed to be politer by lessening the degree of directness. Giving alternatives were more chosen by PSELL group by 33%, whereas the SSELL participants by 16% refused the request forwarded by their equal status interlocutors. This is resorted here that the participants of both the groups wanted to keep their friendship in harmony by saving their friends 'positive face'.

To sum up, it is concluded here that non-native speakers rely more on the linguistic and cultural conventions of their mother tongue. The results showed that the participants of both the groups have remained indirect in their request that showed the significance of the accomplished speech act and, thus, mother tongue cultural items are integrated in order to create a force in the produced speech.

Situation 3: In this situation, a student having computer literacy is refusing the request of a fellow facing a problem that has just occurred to his/her laptop. As a result, the computer expert (participant having same status) refuses the request by employing different strategies. The urgency of the matter is felt at heart and much consideration has been paid to mitigate the refusal in order to save the face of the interlocutors. Ten different refusal strategies are employed of total by the SSELL and PSELL group. Most important that status is equal because a friend is requesting another friend for immediate help as the requestee is facing an urgent problem meant to be solved. Likewise, it was showed that there is a practice of mutual collaboration that is a part of the participant's mother tongue culture.

Results that are shown in the below table 5.9 have showed that both speakers of Pashtu and Saraiki learners of English employed 10 different strategies. Among these strategies, almost all the strategies are employed with equal proportion. There are slight differences in the percentages between both the groups. Taking into consideration, the strategy of positive opinion which is highly utilized by the participants of both the groups, Pashtu speakers used a total of 83% these strategies, whereas the SSELL group employed this strategy a total of 83%. Providing reason/explanation was utilized with same proportion of 66% both groups; the PSELL group used this strategy 66% of the time, while the SSELL group also utilized it by 66%. For example, *PSELL1 Friend, I understand your urgency but I am really sorry that I can't help you. I have to work on a project which is to be submitted today. So sorry I can't help you.*

The below-given table 5.9 shows usage frequency of the main refusal strategies employed by the two groups.

Table 5.9 Occurrence of Pragmatic Transfer among SSELL and PSELL Groups- Situation 3 for Refusal

Strategies of Refusal	Categories	SSELL		PSELL		Contents of Situation
		Pragmatic transfer	%	Pragmatic transfer	%	
Direct refusal	Using performative verbs	2	33%	2	33%	A friend is refusing the request of a friend for not fixing the problem in the laptop.
	Non performative statement	1	16%	-	-	
Indirect refusals	Regret	4	66%	2	33%	
	Wish	1	16%	1	16%	
	Reason, explanation	4	66%	4	66%	
	Alternatives	3	49%	2	33%	
	Acceptance as a refusal	2	33%	2	33%	
	Avoidance	3	49%	3	49%	
	Positive opinion	5	83%	5	83%	
Pause fillers	-	-	1	16%		
Gratitude/appreciation	2	33%	2	33%		

The second most frequently used strategy was the direct refusal realized through using a performative or non performative verb which falls into the category of direct refusals by showing negative ability. Even though both groups seem to prefer to use this strategy with a frequency (33%), the SSELL group also used this strategy as their second preferred by 33%. Another difference worthwhile to mention is that both the groups have expressed refusals using regret, the SSELL group has utilized it by 66%, and the PSELL group has used it by only by 33%, which is slightly more than the Saraiki speakers who used regret by 66%. With regard to the strategy of wish, both groups utilized it with equal proportion by 16%. For example, *PSELL 5 Dear I am glad for asking a help, but I have to complete my work, and it would be hard for me to, so, sorry.* In addition to these strategies, both groups used adjuncts to mitigate their refusals, which are remarks that could not stand alone to function as a refusal. As Table 5.9 shows that both groups have used positive opinion as a strategy with higher frequency by 83%, the strategy of gratitude is utilized equally by 33%. The strategy of pause fillers has only used by PSELL group by 16%. These strategies have been employed to mitigate their refusals, but were only used by the PSELL group. Among

the three types of adjuncts used by both groups, the most utilized was positive opinion, though it seems to be more preferred by the participants of both groups.

Moreover, sequence of refusal in the utterance was also examined according to the different functions of refusal strategies; that is, pre-refusals, head acts, and post-refusals with an aim to explore how strategies are organized in real-time conversations. For example, *SSELL6 Sorry I am very busy these days but you can borrow my laptop for one day*. In this example, head acts represent the minimal unit in the sequence that communicates refusals realized as direct, whereas reason/explanation and postponement was coded as indirect. According to the percentages, both groups predominantly preferred the indirect strategies over direct ones. *SSELL3 Please don't mind, my dear friend because I have a lot of research work to do, and so, I can't help you in such situation*. Pre-refusals are composed of one or more strategies that initiate the sequence and prepare the hearer for the upcoming refusal. Table 5.9 shows the frequency and percentage of pre-refusal strategies utilized by both groups. Pre-refusals not only start negotiation of refusals, but also externally modify the head act within the refusal sequence. *SSELL2, I know your emergency but I am really sorry that I can't, and I am sorry for not helping you out*.

The most common pre-refusal employed to initiate the negotiation for both groups was positive opinion. The data of both the groups showed that 83% of the L2 learners have preferred to use positive opinion to modify their head acts, which was also a routine utilized by the SSELL and PSELL participants at a similar rate in the data (83%). However, the strategy of pause fillers which indicates that the speaker is borrowing some linguistic resources from the mother tongue to the target language. This strategy of pause filler is employed once by 16%, whereas none of the SSELL participant has used any at all. This is also true with the strategy of post refusals in PSELL group, for instance, *PSELL3 uhh, I am sorry. Actually, I am quite busy these days and I would have helped you otherwise. Please don't mind*. While some speakers choose to employ one or more strategies, the others may not utilize any post-refusals at all.

Moreover, the PSELL group preferred to use regret by 33% as it is regarded as face threatening act in their culture which is twice lesser as those used by Saraiki speakers (66%). On the other hand, the participants of both groups favored reason/explanation more (66%) to mitigate their refusals. Another point that is truly

reflected in the table is that none of the participants from each group employed other five strategies among these strategies at all. This example illustrates strategies produced by a SSELL participant in a post refusal sequence, *gigantic apology*, expressing negative ability--head-act, sorry, regret--post-refusal, *I am facing the same situation* (possibility of future acceptance--post-refusal), *SSELL5 OMG, I do understand the urgency of the matter but my dear I have an important work to do. SSELL 2 I have just given* (negative ability--head-act) *my laptop to my brother he will fix it and* (reason/explanation--post-refusal. Reason/explanation was the most frequently used refusal strategy by both groups; participants of the study expressed various explanations when they refused the request. *SSELL1 I am very sorry my dear friend; I wish I could help you but I can't. Can you please ask someone else to help you?*

Since the reason/explanation was the most preferred refusal strategy by both groups overall, the content of this strategy was analyzed in order to explore what type(s) of explanations were considered appropriate and the differences between Pashtu learners of English and Saraiki learners of English and the difference is not significant. *SSELL4 I am sorry. I can't help you right now. Sorry.* Another noteworthy point of this example is the switch from a direct head act in the first episode to an indirect head act in the second episode upon insistence. Thus, the speaker was able to mitigate an indirect refusal with detailed explanations to save the interlocutor's positive face, and emphasized the illocutionary force of the refusal to prevent further insistence, which poses a threat to negative face. *PSELL2 I am really sorry that I have so many tasks to do.* Concerning the preference for head acts in the second episode, both the groups consistently used indirect head act with an acoustic emphasis on negation followed by gratitude to soften the illocutionary force of the refusal. *PSELL5, I wish but I am little busy right now.*

The most frequent choice of indirect refusal found in the present study is giving reasons and explanations. Similarly, the content of reasons also varied which really reflected the speakers' culture. One direct strategy chosen by all research participants to their equal status interlocutors, was giving negative willingness. However, this negative willingness was due to the interference of mothers' tongue linguistic resources followed by other strategies, such as giving reasons or statement of regret. The absence of performing direct strategy by only giving negative willingness shows that all participants seemed to be politer by lessening the degree of

directness. Giving alternatives as a strategy were chosen more by the SSELL group participant by 49%, whereas the PSELL group utilized it by 33% which is comparatively lesser in percentage.

5.4 Summary

Concerning the role of sociopragmatic transfer, it has been clearly evidenced in both the groups. Under the influence of native culture, Saraiki and Pushto language users performed the given situations providing evidence that learning TL is sensitively influenced by the social norms of L1. The data showed that the learners evaluated contexts in TL by means of social perceptions and norms from L1. Moreover, the learners opted for tokens of direct requests in low- and equal-status contexts. Also, following L1 rules, PSELL group used mostly indirect strategies with high status interlocutors, and SSELL group remained balanced in a high-status context. Also, in low- and equal-status scenarios, learners have used H-oriented requests resembling their distribution in L1. Moreover, attention-getters have been extensively used in IL, like in L1, both in high- and low-status contexts. L1 has also influenced types of alerts in IL requests. As for openers, unlike TL, they have been either underused or absent in IL in all situations and their linguistic choices have not been native-like.

Similarly, the absence or underuse of imposition minimisers in low- and equal- status scenarios as well as the absence of apology in equal-status context appears to be L1-motivated. The above remarks make it plausible to claim that learners have assessed the contexts according to L1 assumptions. Keeping other factors in view, the data from the participants' IL performance can be summarized as follows: unlike TL, learners seem to perform the FTAs when interacting with strangers following L1 rules. Cases of direct requests have been attested in IL requests in varying degrees either with close or distant interlocutors, like in L1. Additionally, H-oriented requests have been dominant with close and distant interlocutors and, thus, followed L1 sensibilities. Again, both the participant groups heavily employed attention-getters in interacting with close and distant interlocutors following L1 norms.

Based on these observations, once again, it can be asserted that the learners perceived the given situations on the basis of L1 conventions and social norms. Both groups have been considering an offense in performing requests in high context, in agreement with L1 norms, unlike requesters in TL. Overall, a number of indirect

requests have been employed by SSELL group in high-status context, while both in/direct have been used by PSELL group. Attention-getters have been used in both high and low contexts by both the groups, and therefore, testify an influence of L1 in the TL. More openers have been used by SSELL group in high situations, while PSELL group has used them in low status contexts.

CHAPTER 6

DATA ANALYSIS-III

This chapter presents and analyzes the data from the third data collection tool, that is, semi-structured interviews. The chapter is divided into three broader sections. Section 1 presents the themes, which emerged in respect of the speech act of apology that discuss cultural similarities and differences in the accomplishment of an apology by L2 learners. Section 2 discusses the themes that emerged from the data on the speech act of request. Section 3 focuses on the data on the speech act of refusal. The chapter ends with a brief summary.

6.1 Analysis of Semi-structured Interviews

Eight interviews were conducted; four from PSELL group participants and four from SSELL group participants. The analysis of interviews has been carried out using thematic analysis, which is used as analytical framework for the interview data. The coding structure for the analysis of interview data comprises the development of categories through recurrent analysis of data instead of imposing prearranged categories on the data. The participants were asked to talk about the cultural norms of L1 assigned to different speech acts in L2. Each interview took almost 25 to 35 minutes. The digitally recorded interviews were transcribed, coded, and then categories were developed from these interviews. The development of categories assisted the researcher to develop themes, which later on helped in data analysis, and then, finally conclusions were inferred out of these developed themes. Moreover, the researcher has tried to address the research questions with the help of these developed themes. Multiple themes emerged from the responses of the participants during interview sessions. The following two main themes emerged from nine sub themes identified after categorization and coding of the data (see Appendix D).

- 1) Impact of sociocultural assumptions
- 2) Learning through sociopragmatic transfer

Following sub themes emerged from the data collected through semi structured interviews:

- 1) Celebration of solidarity through the use of mother tongue
- 2) Language as a source of transmission of culture
- 3) Assigning significance to language
- 4) Underlying social perceptions of mother tongue

- 5) Language is a worldview
- 6) Language is power
- 7) Language is a symbol of freedom and identity
- 8) Politeness is a key to win someone's favour
- 9) Social values of L1 cannot be replaced

In the light of the above-mentioned themes, interview data has been presented below. Pseudonyms have been used to refer to the participants.

6.1.1 Theme of Sociocultural Assumptions for the Speech Act of Apology

During the analysis of this theme, the participants adhered to the use of mother tongue that considered cultural norms as core values that are transmitted to make an apology in English either to a low status interlocutor, or in an informal setting. In this regard, the participants were of the view that English can be used as formal mode of expression where a convenience could be felt if interaction takes place with the speakers of other linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Similarly, preference to the use of mother tongue social norms in English shows the occurrence of sociopragmatic transfer, and the participant is feeling at ease in apologizing it becomes difficult for them to display their mother tongue cultural values in English. There are several occasions when learners face a difficulty in expressing their feelings conveniently in English which shows an influence of mother tongue social norms that are embedded in English. Upon the significance of cultural values, it was asserted that there are peculiar expressions found in every culture, which is hard to be presented exactly in English. Therefore, it shows that negative sociopragmatic transfer occurs that create a difficulty we do not find corresponding words in English then we look for alternates in our own language. Moreover, the participant Zarina, a participant from PSELL group further asserted her views in these words:

I will prefer to apologize in Pashtu if the listener is my friend or family member, and I will apologize in Saraiki if the listener is from other Saraikicommunity. I will prefer to apologize in English to a stranger whom I would have no acquaintance or intimacy or who is not known to me.

She further added that mother tongue creates a convenience in apologizing whereas it is very hard to express the same being wished. So, the interference of mother tongue affects the pragmatic competence resultant into the inability of the learners to achieve a proficiency in the target language. Regarding the difficulty to

express appropriately in the target language, it is presumed that learners do accomplish such acts through indirect strategy in mother tongue wherein prevailing cultural norms of L1 can be strictly followed. On the other hand, it creates an obstruction because of less awareness about pragmatic norms of the target language. Zarina further asserted in these words:

Yes, obviously there seems a big difference to me because when I will apologize in Pashtu, I would be enough expressive and convenient while apologizing in English would be difficult for me as compared to my mother tongue.

In this regard, it is pertinent to know that Malala, a PSELL group participant, an interviewee from the same speech community preferred the use of English for making apology. It is worth mentioning here that there is no reliance on the use of mother tongue because one can execute the speech act of apology either in a direct manner, or indirect by saying: “I will feel easy and comfortable with English because one could easily say “sorry” or “I am sorry”. Malala further specified that one can simply express apology in English language where one doesn’t get embarrass to provide explanation in order to rectify the committed offence. Therefore, it shows that as a part of practice in Pashtun culture, ensuring the provision of reasons extends the notion of degradation and insult towards the hearer. Likewise, a definite pause is made by the speaker during the interaction indicates that one is feeling regretful and wishes to compensate to save the face of the hearer. As the participant is unaware about the concept of pragmatic competence, hence creates a communicative gap. Malala states:

In English, I have just to say a few words (as I mentioned earlier) whereas one need to give or has to provide a lot of detail or explanations to make an apology in native tongue.

In this regard Bahadar, a male Pashtu speaker from PSELL group, was of the view that selection of medium during interaction depends mainly on the status of the interlocutor. Likewise, if an interlocutor is holding a high status, then English would be used as medium of transmission that is regarded as a sign of respect in an academic setting, on the other hand, the interviewee declared that mother tongue would be used in the circle of friends. It asserts that English is a preferred language depends on the status of the interlocutor. Preference of English indicates the pragmatic competence of learners in L2 developed through L1. Such words were expressed: “It depends on

person to person. If the person is holding some official authority, then I will apologize in English. If otherwise I will prefer my native language”.

Following the same notion of thought, Gulaba participant from PSELL group equally augmented in the same vein by arguing, like if there is an occasion where one has to display the solidarity with mother tongue, then the act would be definitely accomplished in mother tongue. Hence the data has been obtained from the participants in an academic setting where English is used as a medium of instruction. Therefore, pragmatic transfer can be observed which creates an ease in achieving a proficiency and pragmatic competence in the target language. The preference of languages shows that learners adopt different strategies of directness and indirectness of mother tongue during the accomplishment of communicative acts, which increases the ability to comprehend their pragmatic knowledge of L2. Therefore, sociopragmatic transfer occurs when the speech acts are produced in English. Further, it shows that pragmatic transfer is used as a resource, which in turn increases the ability to comprehend the pragmatic knowledge of learners in L2. He expressed his views thus:

I prefer to apologize in Pashtu when I address the people who are very close to me, my friends or my family members and where I feel myself in informal situation. I make apology in the target language in an academic setting like, school and college.

On the other hand, it was highly acknowledged by Anmol, a female participant from SSELL group extended this notion of transfer wherein the speaker had to translate a thought in mother tongue that could not be expressed the way being wished in L1. In this instance, it is clear that English language learners don't only rely on the linguistic resources of their mother tongue but some cultural norms are integrated into the target language. Moreover, it also reveals that pragmatic transfer hampers the ability of L2 learners when following L1 social norms in the speech acts. These speech acts are accomplished by adopting either direct or indirect strategies without knowing much about strategic allocation during interaction. So, once the process of transfer takes place, it becomes then very difficult to find out an appropriate word to let some impression and scrupulousness so to save the faces of interlocutors. She states in these words:

I find apologizing in mother tongue easier as accompanied with corresponding feelings whereas for apologizing in English, I have to

translate my feelings and emotions and thus the words lose their effectiveness.

Likewise, Anmol, another female participant from SSELL group argued for the significance of mother tongue social and cultural norms because strategic competence of L1 influences the learning of L2, Therefore, it shows that the pragmatic knowledge of L1 is transferred in English, and the pragmatic knowledge of L2 cannot be displayed appropriately due to the influence of L1 pragmatic knowledge. The participant feels at ease with making an apology in mother tongue due to sincerity and wholeheartedness assigned to the speech act in ever language. Therefore, it reveals that L1 influence on L2 affects the pragmatic competence of learners, because learners cannot avoid the influence of L1 cultural norms already acquired during the accomplishment of speech acts in English, which can be clearly reflected in the following words:

I think the one made in Pashtu is easier and convenient because everyone loves his/her native language. When someone makes an apology in native language, there seems an affection, sincerity and wholeheartedness.

Anmol further stated that the act of apology can be explained and expressed in a better way is to use mother tongue, and that create a force within the act. It also asserts that due to lack of pragmatic competence in the target language, one has to borrow some linguistic and cultural features of L1 that creates an ease for learners in the learning process of L2. Likewise, it shows that the occurrence of pragmatic transfer enhances the ability of the learners to comprehend the pragmatic knowledge of L2 via L1. Therefore, it is asserted here that pragmatic transfer is used as a resource in the accomplishment of different communicative acts in the target language that facilitates the learner in learning process of L2. She elaborated her idea thus:

Whatever medium is used one has to make an apology in either language but if we make an apology in English, we might not be able to express in the manner we would be doing it in our native language.

6.1.2 Theme of Learning English through Sociopragmatic Transfer

In responses to this theme, it was demonstrated that social and cultural norms of mother tongue are accompanied in the realization of speech acts in English. The participants were of the view that L2 pragmatic knowledge cannot be acquired independently. Another participant Maula, a male participant from SSELL group

confessed his inability to truly express his views vibrantly in English because transfer of L1 prevailing linguistic conventions was integrated in the second language. It also reveals the significance of participants' mother tongue that occupies a considerable account in learning process of L2. This claim made it apparent that both in/direct strategies are developed through integrating linguistic elements of mother tongue, which cannot be truly translated to convey an idea or thought in English. He expressed his views thus:

I will look into the situation if the matter is very serious then I will prefer to apologize in Saraiki and if the matter is of low importance and not serious then I will prefer to apologize in English. However, I will prefer Saraiki because the way I can use the expressions in Saraiki are not known to me in English.

Upon the politeness of mother tongue which cannot be made prominent if the act is accomplished in the target language. All this occurs due to the interference of the mother tongue which advertently interrupts in the process of learning English. A claim has been made that the participant knows about both the use and usage of their mother tongue where they don't bother to transfer anything rather feel comfortable. On the other hand, it is true with this participant like others of not having balanced proficiency in English to be used accordingly the mother tongue is being used.

A big yes.... If you apologize someone in Saraiki and the words which are used during the accomplishment of this act can't be found in English because one can see a tenderness and politeness in the words of Saraiki which couldn't be traced in English language...because we don't have a balanced proficiency which could meet the required needs. As far as Saraiki is concerned we know both the use and usage of our mother tongue.

He further added to the importance of language during interaction considering much the hearer that a medium which would create an ease, and is understandable to the interlocutors will be used as a medium of transmission. Further, if it does create any inconvenience or leads the interlocutors to miscommunication, then ideas are translated into English language that is perceived as a lingua franca in the modern world. Similarly, translation is a big factor which causes inefficiency in the learners to achieve proficiency in the target language. The participant states:

The language which is understandable to both of them would have a stronger impact on the listener. If the listener does not belong to my native speech community, then I will try to translate it into English in order to make it understandable to create some effect on the listener.

Waqar, a male participant from SSELL group emphasized that though saying sorry in English is direct and sounds less honest as we cannot translate the words of our mother tongues into English because of lack of proficiency in the target language. He elaborated further that transfer hampers their ability to get a proficiency in the target language. Moreover, as the reliance of the participant on the mother tongue reveals their less proficiency due to which pragmatic competence of the learners is badly affected? He stated:

Yes, apologizing in native language is different from apologizing in English because Saraiki is my mother tongue and I can convey my feelings very well but in English we only say sorry but don't attach emotions with it. I usually can't attach those feelings while speaking in English language.

Expressing her views upon the significance of languages, Zarina from PSELL group mentioned that making an apology in mother tongue has got a different significance as it bridges the bond of kinship stronger. At same time, English has not got a different significance as the non-native speakers rely on the linguistic and cultural resources of their respective mother tongues which is not truly identified in other languages, nor can the same pragmatic knowledge be displayed in the target language. These words were uttered: "Apology has significance in Pashtun culture because it makes the relation stronger. Yes, it is also true that apology has a different significance in English". In the same vein of thought, Malala from PSELL group elaborated the notion of involvement of cultural elements that are integrated into English by non-native speakers which reflects the cultural values or norms that create an ease in the process of learning English.

There is a big difference, and native language has a developed significance in our daily life because different cultural practices contribute to its significance. On the other hand, English language has got its different cultural background.

Upon the significance of L1 cultural norms, Anmol, a female participant from SSELL group stated that language and culture are inseparable entities. So, two

languages system cannot be interwoven but falls apart. Most important to note here is the point that language and culture are developing simultaneously because cultural knowledge is displayed through language.

Every culture and language have its own way of apologizing and the same is the case with Pashtu. I don't think so that apologizing in Pashtu has the same significance in English language.

A participant Gulab from PSELL group added that he does not use much effort to mitigate an action but expression comes naturally and are relieved without any obstruction. As translating an idea from one language to another requires some efforts to bring some linguistic resources from mother tongue meant to be incorporated in the target language. Extending the notion of language as a source of transmission, it was asserted that solely relies on the use of the mother tongue to show his affinity and acquaintance which can be realized at the hearers' end. He shouted thus:

Yes, and a big yes! There is a difference. In Pashtu language we do not need to make up our mind for the thoughts, whatever comes to our mind we neither utter it nor need to translate it from any other language? The one made in my mother tongue or native language because in native language there comes the natural flow or expressions of emotions or thoughts which has definitely a stronger effect on listener.

On the other hand, the said participant stated that due to unawareness of the pragmatic norms of L2, the significance of the speech act of apology cannot be accomplished in the target language. Understanding the pragmatic norms of a language makes an addition for the speech act to be performed through the lens of following the norms of the respective language. He states: "I think, the act of apologizing in every culture has a different significance provided that apology is made accordingly to the norms of the respective language".

At the sociopragmatic level, transfer was operative in the evaluation of situations in the target culture by means of mother culture's sensibilities. As the below-mentioned example illustrates, learners tended to freely make reference to the hearer as the doer of the action through the predominance of S-oriented requests (can you, will you, do you, could you etc.). In addition to transfer, other factors also impacted the learner performance: lack of pragmatic competence, the inability to differentiate between excuses: I beg your pardon vs. I am sorry). The sociopragmatic

dimension of transfer in the accomplishment of speech acts to EFL learners is reminiscent of the statement of Thomas (1983) that it could be culturally sensitive as it entails implementing a new system of beliefs. These two styles reflect cultural difference. The Pashtun culture emphasizes the role of the H in doing the action as a sign of solidarity, involvement and spontaneity which characterize interactions in English. In Saraiki culture, avoiding reference to the H as the bearer of action is a typical way to mitigate imposition. Anmol from SSELL group states:

In my opinion, apologizing has the same significance in both the cultures, if my listener is a Saraiki native speaker better apologize in Saraiki, if belonging to other linguistic background, better apologize in English because there would be some cross-cultural variation due to which they might not be able to make an apology in the native tongue.

As far as external mitigating devices are concerned, learners have translated words, expressions or even whole moves from L1 thinking that they would carry the same illocutionary force in TL. These examples bear witness:

Every culture has got its different way of making apologies. Most importantly, we often make apology in Saraiki and very less in English because I think we make apologies in English in a very straightforward manner and direct too.

Interviewer: For example?

I am sorry. I didn't mean to do it. Likewise,

Interviewer: Any example for apology in Saraiki?

Asan ko maafkar cha, wat ghalti na thi we sun asanenmatlab v ko nahe apay the gayenthusaasan da gaaldeyyakeenkar cha (Please pardon me.

I will not repeat this kind of act. I didn't mean to do so but all at once it happened or as a coincidence. Please believe me, and trust my words).

In the above example, learners are unaware of the pragmatic value of direct forms in the target language as they are perceived inconsiderate and rude. Therefore, maintaining them in IL apologies may generate pragmalinguistic failure. It is important to note here that this is not necessarily a sign of pragmatic competence, since this strategy is often realized by transparent linguistic structures (modals). The overuse of such modals can be considered a by-product of textbooks. Also, it might be an outcome of L1 influence, since in Saraiki language modal items employed are often those of ability. Arooj, a female participant from SSELL group contended that

speakers rely on the use of mother tongue, and intend to express their ideas without creating any communicative gap or pragmatic ambiguity which goes in line with Van Lier, to develop “a wide panoramic view of self” (2008, p.54). Upon these remarks one cannot ignore the adverse effects of the use of sociopragmatic transfer resulting in the creation of problems in the form of utter violation of the pragmatic norms of English. She expressed thus:

Making an apology in native language would be with more honest because all kind of linguistic resources are activated in order to remove the grievance. The one in mother tongue where we would have a plenty of appropriate words would have a stronger effect on the listener as we accomplish it wholeheartedly.

She further elaborated, and it can be argued that cross cultural practices are observed in the circle of the friends and that is the reason she preferred apologizing in the mother tongue during his conversation among friends in an informal setting. Through pragmatic transfer, learners do accomplish several acts to increase their linguistic skill; gain understanding, and develop a sense of their world which as a result, affects the pragmatic competence of the learners in the target language. Upon the execution of apology act, she elucidated that making an apology in different languages has got a different mode, like, she stated thus:

- a) We bring cultural resources from our mother tongue that are assigned during the accomplishment of the same speech act in English.
- b) Saraiki speakers consider it an offence if apology is not accomplished in Saraiki language.

Every culture has a different way. Definitely, I bring some cultural values which are attached duly into English language. Like in English I would say that I am sorry I will not repeat it. The same also goes like this in Saraiki, *asan ko maafkar, wat na the wesun* (Pardon me, I will not repeat it).

Maula, a male participant from SSELL group stated that learners prefer to use mother tongue, which opens new horizon/dimensions for them. For this participant, deeper learning also refers to language development, cognitive development, and content understanding.

A big no.... Because Saraiki speakers has got different options in begging someone an apology. If someone is annoyed at you so you can

change his mind in different ways which I don't know as how to do it in English language. Secondly, we lack those polite expressions in English which we have in our mother tongues.

On another occasion he stated that

In every culture there are different sets of apologies. So, apologies are made accordingly with their separate cultural norms and even incorporating cultural norms of mother tongue into English sounds odd and awkward too. For example, making an apology in English by saying, sorry I will not repeat it, whereas in Saraiki we usually say, *yar ma maafimangda, ma dobaranakaresan*, (Buddy, I beg your apology. I will not do it again) even we touch one's beard or bow down as a sign of feeling extremely or desperately sorry.

Waqar, a male participant from SSELL group uttered that there is no established norm or any hard and fast rule to display a single language during communication between friends. He asserts that it is impossible to learn a foreign language with the interference of the mother tongue. He extended his views: "Apologizing in native language is easy because of our full command on our native language".

He also explained the notion that these speech acts are accomplished with the help of an interference of the mother tongue which are employed either in a direct manner or indirect. Thus, pragmatic transfer is used as a resource to accomplish different communicative tasks. At the same time, it also hampers the ability of L2 learners to achieve a balanced proficiency in the target language. Besides, learners with less proficiency in foreign language (English) often feel extreme linguistic insecurity and uncertainty. He forwarded his views in these words:

There is a big difference in making an apology in Saraiki than English. In fact, when we use a language, we use a lot of words but in English due to lack of proficiency we usually say sorry which doesn't have the same effect in Saraiki language.

The next section discusses the second emerged theme for the speech acts of request.

6.2 Theme of Sociocultural Assumptions for the Speech Act of Request

Zarina asserted if the listener is my relative or family member or my friend, I will prefer Pashtu to forward my request and if the listener is a stranger, I will prefer English language. So, it is asserted that the use of mother tongue indicated the reliance of the learners as much politeness is assigned in Pashtu language while making a request. It is important to mention here that Pashtun participants in the entire process of this study supplied indirect discourse strategies. She herself has endorsed it in these words: “Yes requesting is different in Pashtu from English because in mother tongue I can make an indirect request while I can make a direct request in English language”. It is astonishing to note that she likes direct requests which are considered more direct and shall be complied with a prompt response. The directness which is associated with English language showed the inefficiency of the English learner in the target language to perform indirect requests which are accomplished indirectly in the mother tongue. It also reveals that mother tongue put some constraints for not ensuring the provision of explanation or reason as a strategy to mitigate upon the request of the requestee. For example, “For me it becomes very easy to make a request in English than Pashtu because as English is a more straightforward language than Pashtu”.

Zarina a Pashtu speaker from PSELL group further elaborated like earlier in the speech act of apology she was occupied with almost the same contents of idea about such acts to be accomplished in the target language. Likewise, English is viewed as direct and straightforward can be used for accomplishing different communicative tasks. This declaration of English as direct and Pashtu as indirect contends for holding relatively different status of the interlocutor which is not a variable of this study. Hence, it clearly indicates that the participant violates the social norms of the mother tongue and shows his inability to understand the far-reaching results of direct request at the hearer’s end. She states:

The one made in English is more direct than the Pashtu one because in English I will just say “would you help me please” and in Pashtu I can’t make nor can find some appropriate words for requesting that would be more direct. English is more suitable for making direct requests.

In contrast to all this, it was quiet astonishing to note that a participant from the same PSELL group Bahadar, another participant from PSELL group commented thus in his response to this question:

I think the one made in Pashtu is more direct and straightforward because my words directly affect the listener. And the one made in English aren't that much effective as compared to the act accomplished in mother tongue.

In the above example it is illustrated that mother tongue sociopragmatic transfer into target language obstructs the learning process. As a notion of common understanding when the interlocutors belong to same speech community, the interaction that takes place between them is pragmatically interpreted via the mode of their mother tongue. In such situations, there would be less possibility for the emergence of miscommunication or cross-cultural failure. Another participant, Malala from PSELL group explicitly expressed her views stating that it becomes very difficult to execute a speech act in the target the way being executed in the mother tongue. Moreover, she confessed the lack of expressions in the execution to attaching the mother tongue pragmatic norms as it couldn't be embedded into the target language. Thus, it has been noted in the reliance which definitely affects and social perception of cultural are grossly violated. She extended in these words:

Yes, I think one can make a request in a better way in native language than doing the same in English language. One might not be able or due to lack of vocabulary in English, he or she might not make it the way being wished.

Likewise, an interviewee of SSELL group, Arooj states as a part of cultural practice the knowledge of which is shared equally among Saraiki speech community to provide many explanations in order to compensate with the requestive force to save the face image of the hearer, and is often regarded as an empathy and face-saving act. Indirectness has been associated with the mother tongue where it is difficult to be accomplished by adopting indirect strategy during discourse. It is also true with this participant that paralinguistic transfer has been reflected where some mother tongue linguistic resources are utilised and is forwarded as an example to manipulate the true worth of her response. In this connection, she demonstrated that,

The one made in English would be more direct and straightforward because speaking in English requires a lot of words which we do lack.

So, in mother tongue, we remain more indirect and less straightforward as the decency of the speech context requires that. Like in Saraiki, *asan darkhast karendenen asan da hek kaam karo cha* (I request you and beg your favour in extending some help towards me, I would be pleased) while in English I would say ‘Kindly help me’.

Below a detailed discussion is presented on the theme of learning through sociopragmatic transfer for the speech act of request.

6.2.1 Theme of Learning through Sociopragmatic Transfer

Upon the significance of language, a Pashtu speaker asserted that making a request in the mother tongue creates an urge within the hearer with an immediate response to be complied with the request. Most importantly, once these strategies are performed through transferring cultural knowledge of mother tongue either in a direct or indirect manner shows the unawareness of the learners about pragmatic norms of the target language. Therefore, sociopragmatic transfer affects the competence and the resource of pragmatic transfer couldn't be appropriately utilized. He stated thus:

The one made in mother tongue..... because one knows the values or weight of words of native language. So, he or she uses the proper words of native language for a request. For example, if I am putting forward my request for a mobile phone, in Pashtu I will say, *ma yu mobile pakaar da. Da ma study kedair help kawi. Da ma internet the access kawi* (I need a mobile phone. It helps me in my studies. Through that I can make an access to internet) that would be politer and it would have an effect on the listener too and if I will use such words which make an appeal to the emotion of the person because if you want to have something, you need to use a very polite language.

Another participant from SSELL group stated her views about the social perception of cultural norms of the mother tongue, thus resulted in negative sociopragmatic transfer which affects the process of achieving pragmatic competence in the target language. As participants of SSELL group attached some definite explanation to save the positive face of the hearer which becomes mandatory for them to incorporate the social norms of the mother tongue while learning English. Anmol demonstrated that, “The request made in mother tongue would be politer because speakers attached peculiar cultural values which reveals their politeness”. Another participant viewed the accomplishment in the target language through the adaptation

of an appropriate tone which can make a difference and can produce different effects at the hearers' end. Arooj, a female participant from SSELL group states:

It also depends mainly upon the tone of the speaker which can make a big difference if use in appropriate manner would have politer and convincing effects upon the listener.

6.3 Theme of Sociocultural Assumption for the Speech Act of Refusal

Participants celebrates solidarity with the use of mother tongue as PSELL group participant data showed that in Pashtun culture elaborating the refusals create a pragmatic ambiguity so blunt refusals are preferred by showing a direct rejection of the request for not leaving the hearer in any quest or distant space. Al this happens due to lack of pragmatic proficiency in English as the participant cannot detached the social perceptions of the mother tongue accomplishing a speech act in the learning process of English, as a result of this transfer, it does affect then the pragmatic competence. Zarina, a female participant from PSELL group asserted thus:

I don't think so that there is any difference, like, if we refuse someone's offer, we would directly refuse the offer and will say because I don't do this. So, in both cases the listener would mind this.

Another interviewee Malala from the same PSELL group advocated the case in these words:

For me it is easier in Pashtu because I can make a refusal very directly in Pashtu than English as I prefer a direct refusal than indirect one. If I refuse in my mother tongue, it would be more direct and straightforward.

In contrast to this notion, Gulab, a male participant from PSELL group briefly asserted that making a refusal in English is simple rejection of the offer though much linguistic resources are available in the mother tongue but due to inefficiency in English becomes hard to interpret the way being wished. Though the speaker wishes to incorporate or transfer the social and cultural norms of mother tongue in a futile attempt. Similarly, refusal can be mitigated to compensate with the force of request in mother tongue, while the undue interference of mother tongue affects the pragmatic competence. He further states:

Yes, it is different because in the native language one can express him/herself in a better way and reasons of refusal are explained in an

easy way. For example, if someone asks me for a pen or some money, now in English I would just say I am sorry I cannot help you but in Pashtu I can explain like, *ma sarakhoowspaisayneshta ma khpalmalgaritha war kray aw ka lag makhkaydeyveliwa nu biaba.....* (Sorry, I don't have money right now as I have already lent it to one of my friends some time ago, would that you have asked a bit earlier?).

A participant of SSELL group was of the opinion that the provision of enough reasons behind the non-compliance with the request projects both the speaker and hearer. He asserted that there is no common domain which is equally shared by all languages. Moreover, the use of overstatement indicates that pragmatic transfer takes place during an interaction. Maula stated thus:

Yes, both are poles apart in each case, like, in English one can reject it through the use of a few words while in Saraiki one has to attach other elements to support your argument. One can provide enough detail about his compulsion or other reasons can be stated.

The next section discusses the second theme for the speech act of refusal.

6.3.1 Theme of Learning through Sociopragmatic Transfer

Upon the analysis of this theme, both the group responses asserted that some participants employ these strategies in order to establish a relative social distance which contends to the significance of the mother tongue on such occasions. Further, lacking proficiency in English is regarded to be less embarrassing at the hearer's end as one can make a direct refusal by saying 'sorry' that conveys a simple negation. Zarina from PSELL group was of the view:

I think the one made in English would be less embarrassing because refusing someone in mother tongue would be harsher and embarrassing. So, I think we should use the target language for making a refusal.

On this occasion, Bahadar, a participant from PSELL group spoke, making a refusal in English is considered as direct because the speaker in the below example wishes to attach the social perception of culture in the target language but couldn't do so because transfer hampers the ability of such English learners. He states in these words: "I think the refusal made in English is more direct and straightforward because the refusal made in English lacks the attachment of genuine reasons".

Another participant Gulab from PSELL group asserted that one should realise the listener of being no help to him/her. His statement showed that the accomplishment of this speech act elaborates the body language which can be conveniently expressed by the listener. He states: “The one I made in my mother tongue because listener can judge or understand my emotions that I extend towards him or her of not being of any help”. Another participant, Anmol from saraiki speech community demonstrated that sociopragmatic transfer occurs during the accomplishment of speech acts in an interaction. One should not provide any reason behind refusal instead avoid it as it is considered a threat at the face of the hearer. She holds the view in these words:

The refusal made in English are more straightforward because we use a very limited set of words in making refusal. Secondly, in English language we do avoid face threatening acts which might develop a negative image and we became conscious in our attempt that other might mind it.

Another participant from the same community of SSELL group, Arooj stated that one can deny someone’s request by using a limited set of words which contends for rejection that is also hearer oriented. Moreover, it becomes very difficult to display the cultural knowledge of mother tongue that couldn’t be truly interpreted in the target language. Thus, it is influenced by mother tongue in the form of transfer that takes place in translating cultural norms of L1 into the target language. She presented her views thus:

The one made in native language is more straightforward because we just come with the use of a very few limited words which clearly reflect the negation like in a very direct way, we reject the offers. On the other hand, we search out for appropriate social norms used in refusing someone’s request in English language.

Another participant added that one can attach the elements of politeness of mother tongue which cannot be exactly presented in English. Making a refusal doesn’t mean to lose someone’s favour but to win. So, this reveals that mother tongue cultural norms are not followed, which results in the form of negative transfer. Maula from SSELL group stressed his thought and states:

I feel at ease with my mother tongue because one can use politer and tender words through that one can win the hearers' favour easily. I do lack that politeness or ease in English.

Another from Saraiki speech community, Waqar, a male participant from SSELL group who labeled himself an over user of English language and doesn't bother to think that the act of refusal was accomplished successfully or not? It showed that real force behind the act is employed in mother tongue in a direct manner too, which becomes difficult to be displayed accordingly, and in an appropriate manner in L2. In other words, transfer put constrain in the learning process of English where the learner display inability to avoid the use of the mother tongue. He declared thus:

The act of refusal made in native language would be more direct and straightforward than English because we become more serious in the use of native language conversation than English language.

6.4 Summary

The overall performance of the participants of both the groups showed that the learners relied on cultural values duly attached with their native language during the accomplishment of speech acts in the target language. Secondly, it has been noted that the choice of mother tongue as a mode of transmission contends their reliance upon the prevailing social values and linguistic norms which are transferred into the target language which indicated their inability to utilize the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer positively. Therefore, this transfer affected their pragmatic competence and the learners did not achieve a balanced proficiency due to negative pragmatic transfer of mother tongue in English.

To conclude the above discussion, the learners' reliance upon mother tongue cultural resources showed their inefficiency in the target language where they could not display their cultural knowledge and values independently. It has been apprehended from the data that speech acts have different significance in different languages across the world. In the accomplishment of speech acts, it has been observed that the cultural elements of mother tongue are incorporated into the target language. Secondly, the data also showed the participants' lack of command on the target language vocabulary. Thus, it can be inferred from the above discussion that negative pragmatic transfer affects the pragmatic competence of second language learners.

CHAPTER 7

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section presents the findings obtained after the analysis of the data culled from three data collection tools, viz. written discourse completion tasks, open oral role plays and semi-structured interviews. The second section triangulates the data culled from the three data collection tools. The third section is dedicated to discussing the contribution of this study to the already existing body of research in the chosen area of study. The last section offers a brief summary to conclude the chapter.

7.1 Findings of the Study

The analysis of the data revealed significant results about the performance of the selected English language learners who were guided and motivated by their mother tongue's sociocultural resources and norms. In this way, the study traced multiple indications of pragmatic transfer as the participants relied more on the sociopragmatic norms of their mother tongue as it was found that social and cultural resources of mother tongue were used when accomplishing the speech acts in English.

The participants of both the groups were occasionally observed employing pragmatolinguistic transfer as a resource when Islamic greetings and religious appealers were involved in their production of English responses. Moreover, sociopragmatic transfer used by the participants occurred in the form of deviation from the social norms of the target language. The responses gained through WDCTs were analysed regarding the assumptions underlying the selection of these strategies at sociopragmatic level. The performance of the two learner groups, Saraiki and Pashtu, was compared and contrasted in order to establish cross-cultural and interlanguage variations.

In contrast to the written data from WDCTs, the oral data was collected through conducting open role plays which were audio recorded. The data revealed that both the groups were inclined to being more indirect than direct in rejecting requests to same-status interlocutors. Even though, PSELL group was found to be indirect in declining friends' requests but in fact they eluded the direct rejection by saying "no" and were found inclined to expressing 'inability' as a strategy more frequently. The strategy of expressing 'inability' was preferred when the participants of the study did not want to be direct because the focus was made on the intent of the

interlocutor. Besides, by using this strategy, the speaker extended his/her feelings to develop an image of being unable to accept a request for the reason that it was not their need.

All the participants from both the groups unanimously agreed to the interference of mother tongue in the execution of speech acts in English. The participants of the study preferred to employ the sociopragmatic norms of their respective mother tongues and delivered extended responses during the interview sessions. A summary of the findings obtained from the analysis of the collected data is presented below:

- In the data collection tool of WDCTs, it was found during the accomplishment of the speech act of apology that the Pashtu respondents used more direct strategies with the frequency of 26%, and the Saraiki respondents were more indirect with only 12% while seeking apology from the chairperson or professor. It was found that the Pashtu respondents were more indirect with 9%, and the Saraiki respondents were more direct by 27% while seeking apology from a close friend.
- In requests, the PSELL group was found to be more indirect by 21%, and the SSELL group was more direct in forwarding a request even to a higher status interlocutor. In contrast to these, both the groups were found to be more direct in forwarding a request to the same or equal status interlocutor.
- In the speech act of refusal, it was found that the PSELL group members were more indirect than the SSELL group members.
- In the second data collection tool of open role plays, it was found that the PSELL group members were more direct while the SSELL group members were more indirect in submitting their apologies to a higher status or same status interlocutor.
- The PSELL group members were found to be more indirect than the SSELL group members in forwarding a request to a higher status interlocutor. It is surprising that the Pashtu group respondents were found using more direct strategies even while forwarding a request to the same status interlocutor; on the other hand, the SSELL group

respondents were more indirect in making their requests to a close friend.

- In the accomplishment of refusal as a speech act, it was found that the Pashtu respondents were more direct in their responses while the Saraiki respondents were more indirect in rejecting someone's offer or request.
- During the interview session, it was found that the Pashtu group members preferred the use of mother tongue which showed their reliance upon mother tongue linguistic and cultural resources. It was revealed that the Saraiki group members relied more on the norms and conventions of the target language which indicated their pragmatic competence in the target language.

Detailed findings from the three tools have been provided in three sub-sections below:

7.1.1 Findings from WDCTs

The findings from this tool revealed that the SSELL and the PSELL subjects employed almost the same strategies in the accomplishment of the speech acts under study. Therefore, both the groups opted for modal items, speaker-oriented requests and consultative devices. As far as the learner production is concerned, sociopragmatic transfer was evident. Investigating upon the strategies for refusal to request in the case of equal status, it was found that not all strategies that Beebe, et al (1990) have offered were used by both the groups. The SSELL group employed mostly the strategy of inability, unwillingness, and acceptance as refusal, alternative, and excuse to discard a request, on the other hand, the PSELL group only used inability, unwillingness and excuse. It was observed that mostly the respondents of the PSELL group strictly adhered to keeping into consideration the social hierarchy while accomplishing a speech act in the presence of an elderly person as an acquired cultural practice. It can be one of the reasons that the PSELL participants were more inclined to use direct denial than following other strategies.

It was further revealed that the production of the selected speech acts for the present study was influenced by their respective mother tongues and cultures. The participants utilized many sociopragmatic rules of their mother tongues when realizing requests in English. Instead of using an English salutation as an antecedent to their requests, many participants of the study were inclined to offer Islamic greeting

‘Asslamu ‘alaikum’ in their responses. It clearly shows the use of culture specific linguistic items which is a violation of the pragmalinguistic norms of the foreign language which are being influenced by the native culture of the participants. A majority of the participants from both the groups used the honorific ‘Sir’ as a professional title that conveyed reverence. The same title is used frequently in academic settings as a sign of respect for educators. The participants also used honorifics as attention getters before their request sets.

This kind of pragmatic transfer indicates that not only learners’ production in the target language is affected by the mother tongue intervention, but also their insight of the L2. Furthermore, the content of reasons also varied which reflected the speakers’ culture. Sometimes, it was a fictitious reason by saying that the respondent was busy as found in the SSELL group refusals. This happened when refusing a person of equal status but with distant relationship. It is evident that the participants of the present study exploited the sociopragmatic norms of their native culture as reflected in their responses to the English WDCTs. The participants have employed this strategy in their responses to situation 3 where the addressees were addressed as equal in status with the respondents.

Also, SSELL participants’ apologies revealed a different arrangement. In responses to situation 3, the PSELL group participants employed an IFID as a strategy and mostly strengthened their apologies by using adverbs such as “really” or “so,” but SSELL participants used less IFIDs in an informal context. Thus, it was inferred from the results that PSELL participants used more repentance and self-blaming when the offended person was a close friend. One possible reason could be a close acquaintance and strong private relationship or the community grounded nature of the Pashtu language. In the case of Saraiki speakers, it was found that they performed less cultural norms and somewhat remained bound to the apologetic mode of expression as in situation 3. As a matter of fact, when the apology receiver was a close friend, less consideration was given to the apology by the SSELL group participants.

One of the most prominent affinities between Saraiki respondents and Pashtu respondents was in the employment of IFIDs as a strategy for making an apology. The IFIDs were utilized equally in SSELL and PSELL group data. The IFIDs used by the PSELL group were the expressions such as “sorry.” With respect to SSELL participants, it was found that they had used a similar frequency of IFIDs to the PSELL participants, and their choice of IFID was “I am sorry” which can be

perceived as a more native-like approach to apologizing. It can be inferred from the results on IFID usage as a strategy that Saraiki speakers are less direct in their apologies than the Pashtu speakers. Also, it was found that SSELL group used intensifiers as a strategy in their apologies while Pashtu speakers did not look at them as indispensable. In terms of the strategy of offer of repair, SSELL participants employed offers but PSELL group adhered to cultural norms that did not allow the PSELL group participants to employ this strategy. In situation 3 on requests, the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer was very obvious. The data further proved that the treatment of subcategories of strategies was almost similar to L1. On the basis of these findings, it can be claimed that both the groups in Pakistani ESL setting have achieved a balanced pragmatic competence while using the target language.

The data also showed that PSELL participants tended to be more indirect in submitting their apologies than the SSELL participants. Also, it is evident that the relationship between the wrongdoer and the offended has a high outcome on the mode of apologizing. Although the Saraiki speakers were found closer to the target cultural norms as compared to the PSELL group, it was found that the participants were still affected by the social norms of the native culture. The analysis of requests showed that pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic transfers were at play. At the sociopragmatic level, request perspective had the least immunity to pragmatic transfer.

To sum up the findings of WDCTs, it is evident from the data that the learners from both the cultures rely more on the sociopragmatic norms of the mother tongue when accomplishing speech acts in the target language. The reliance takes the form of pragmatic transfer which puts the speaker in a situation where he/she has to perform a communicative act directly or indirectly in the target language depending on the cultural norms of his/her native language.

7.1.2 Findings from Oral Role Plays

Surprisingly, the PSELL group tended more to conceal their incongruities with a definite pause of silence and formed indirect strategies. It was observed that the participants carefully kept interlocutors' feelings distant in order to avoid confrontation, even when the participants showed disagreement and rarely used direct 'no'. The respondents from SSELL group were found to be more indirect in making a request but more direct in declining a refusal. On the other hand, the participants of PSELL group were more inclined to being indirect in declining a request. The SSELL

group showed a tendency to use direct strategies with their friends because they did not have any responsibility or commitment towards their friends so the speakers felt free and independent in the utterance of the expressions.

To restate the findings, while Saraiki learners of English preferred to use reason/explanation as their refusal head acts, Pashtu speakers chose to use reason/explanation to modify their head acts with a higher percentage. Another difference found in the data was that Pashtu learners of English used regret as a post-refusal strategy twice as much as Saraiki learners of English. These results implied that the learners seemed to have negatively transferred the strategies from their native language to express the three selected speech acts in English.

The learners' tendency to provide reasons or justifications according to Saraiki cultural norms was found more salient when the conductor of the role play insisted on the invitation. All Pashtu participants who did not provide specific reasons or no reasons at all at first, stated detailed explanations upon insistence. However, the present study also demonstrates that the task of learning new L2 pragmatic knowledge may itself be a substantial one for adult learners. A considerable amount of knowledge needed for native-like requesting behaviour is not available to these English learners from either LI or universal pragmatic knowledge. Hence, it is evident from the data that pragmatic transfer was used as a resource to accomplish different communicative tasks and it can be concluded that the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer resulted in the form of sociopragmatic transfer which created an ease for the learners in acquiring the established social norms of the target language.

7.1.3 Findings from Semi-structured Interviews

The following two main themes were emerged after the coding and categorization of the collected data.

- Theme of Sociocultural assumptions
- Theme of learning through sociopragmatic transfer

During the analysis of the first theme, the participants of both groups were found exposed to the influence of mother tongue while seeking an apology in English either to a low status interlocutor, or in an informal setting. Similarly, the PSELL group participants were found vocal in giving preference to the use of mother tongue social norms in English that occurred in the form of sociopragmatic transfer. There are several occasions when learners faced a difficulty in expressing their feelings

conveniently in English which showed an influence of mother tongue social norms that are embedded in English. Upon the significance of cultural values, it was found among the PSELL group participants that there are peculiar expressions found in every culture, which is hard to be presented exactly in English. So, the interference of mother tongue affects the pragmatic competence of the PSELL group participants resulting in the inability of the learners to achieve a proficiency in the target language. Regarding the difficulty to express appropriately in the target language, it was revealed from the PSELL group participants that learners' accomplishment of speech acts through direct strategy reflects the direct influence of mother tongue in the learning process of L2. In addition, the PSELL group further maintained that cultural values of mother tongue cannot be exactly performed in the vein of target language norms. In short, it was found that the interference of mother tongue cultural norms not only interrupts but hampers the ability of the learners to achieve pragmatic competence in the target language.

Moreover, in the interview sessions, participants of PSELL group preferred the significance of mother tongue expressions to ensure the provision of detailed explanation or being wished, for them, it's not what is known being impolite. Regarding the second theme, a participant Malala also shared her insights on the point: "Pathan people are more sensitive in this case, they take it (the refusal) personal, and if you refuse Pashtu speaker many times, probably you can break their hearts". The learners' interview responses indicated that Pashtu learners of English still heavily relied on pragmatic conventions of Pashtun culture to accomplish different communicative acts. Surprisingly, it was found that PSELL group interviewees were more exposed to the influence of mother tongue cultural norms that according to them, creates an ease in the learning process of L2. This process was executed through transferring mother tongue cultural norms during the accomplishment of the selected speech acts in English. Hence, the data of interview sessions found that the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer affects the pragmatic competence of the learners wherein the mother tongue interference creates this difficulty. To sum up the above discussion, it was revealed that the pragmatic norms of target language cannot be acquired independently without the influence of mother tongue. These words were uttered: "Apology has significance in Pashtun culture because it makes the relation stronger. Yes, it is also true that apology has a different

significance in English”. To sum up, it was found that sociopragmatic transfer can be used as a resource for learning the pragmatic norms of the target language.

On the other hand, the SSELL group participants were found of the view that English can be used as formal mode of communication where a convenience could be felt if interaction takes place with the speakers of other linguistic and cultural backgrounds. The SSELL participants were feeling at ease in apologizing in English that indicated their pragmatic competence and a balanced level of proficiency in English. Moreover, the SSELL participants showed much inclination towards the use of target language norms in appropriate manner. It was found that the participants of this group were less influenced by the linguistic and cultural resources of mother tongue. It was revealed that the interference of mother tongue causes difficulties in achieving certain level of proficiency in the target language. Regarding the significance of mother tongue cultural norms, it was found among the SSELL group interviewees that cultural and social norms of L1 cannot be completely overlooked during the accomplishment of the speech acts in the target language.

In responses to the second theme, it was found among the SSELL group that social and cultural norms of mother tongue are accompanied in the realization of speech acts in English. The participants were of the view that L2 pragmatic knowledge cannot be acquired independently. It also revealed the significance of participants’ mother tongue that occupies a considerable account in learning process of L2. This claim made it apparent that both in/direct strategies are developed through integrating linguistic and cultural elements of mother tongue, which cannot be truly translated to convey an idea or thought in English. The SSELL group interviewee further expressed their views upon the significance of languages; it was found that making an apology in the mother tongue has got a different significance as it bridges the bond of kinship stronger. At same time, English has got a different significance as the non-native speakers do rely on the linguistic and cultural resources of their respective mothers’ tongue which could not be truly identified in other languages, nor the same pragmatic knowledge of L1 can be displayed in the target language.

To conclude, the interviewees of both the groups have used linguistic and cultural items that clearly reveals the influence of mother tongues, and word-for-word translation which were endorsed during interviews by the participants. At the sociopragmatic level which was the focus of the present study, transfer was effective in the assessment of responses in the target language by means of mother culture’s

sensibilities. Semi structured interviews revealed that the English language learners demonstrated that this tendency may have rooted in differences in cultural norms. The comments from these learners of English suggested that in Pashtun culture insistence is one of the politeness strategies employed by the interlocutor, and insistence is interpreted by the refuser as a cue to provide explicit reasons. As a result, Pashtulearners of English were inclined to follow their native cultural norms more than the Saraiki learners of English.

7.2 Differences in Communication Strategies between Pashtu and Saraiki Cultures

Although there were several similarities in the accomplishment of the speech acts under investigation but there were also some significant differences in the accomplishment of the selected speech acts. The differences can be related to the participants' diverse cultures and linguistic backgrounds. In the accomplishment of the speech act of apology, it was observed that Pashtu speakers were less inclined to the usage of IFID because they considered it as a high-level offence if the speaker of a high status/aged or holding an authority. It was also noted that Pashtu speakers provided less explanation in order to mitigate and minimize the effect of the committed offence. On the other hand, it was found that Saraiki speakers used more IFID ensuring the provision of explanation in order to save their face and to justify themselves.

Analysis of the data also revealed that both the groups were indirect in rejecting someone's request holding a higher status. The different linguistic expressions used by the two groups were in good accordance with the different sociopragmatic characteristics of the situations. Moreover, the preferred strategy of both the groups for the execution of indirect requests was similar and a propensity was shown for conventionally indirect requests. The Saraiki speakers displayed a greater (formal and informal) familiarity with the English pragmatic norms and were found possessing a relatively higher level of pragmatic competence than the Pashtu speakers.

With respect to the speech act of refusal, there was no substantial difference between the two groups in their choice of opting for either direct or indirect refusals. Neither Pashtu participants nor Saraiki participants among English language learners could be viewed as more closely observant in their pragmatic behaviour of the norms

of target language. Thus, the two groups used negative transfer of their L1 directness strategies for refusals in English.

According to a Saraiki participant of the current study, refusals constitute different feelings in both cultures. During the interview session, he said: "I feel convenient with saying 'no' to people in English; it feels like I'm not offending them. In Saraiki culture, people say 'no' more easily than the people in Pashtun culture as Pashtuns regard it a severe offence". The participants also employed strategies that softened the force of refusals by providing explanations to save their interlocutors' face.

It was also observed that the production of the selected speech acts for the present study was influenced by their respective mother tongue and culture. The participants utilized many sociopragmatic rules of their mother tongue when realizing requests in English. Instead of using an English salutation as antecedents to their requests, many participants of the study were inclined to offer Islamic greetings 'Asslamu 'Alaikum' in their responses. It clearly shows the use of culture specific linguistic items which is a violation of the pragmalinguistic norms of the foreign language. A majority of the participants from both the groups used the honorific 'sir' as a professional title that conveyed reverence. The participants also used honorifics as attention getters before their request sets.

Such instances of pragmatic transfer indicate that the learners' production in the target language is affected by the mother tongue intervention. Furthermore, the content of reasons also varied which reflected the speakers' culture. Sometimes, it was a fictitious reason such as the respondent was busy as found in the SSELL group refusals. This happened when refusing a person of equal status but with distant relationship. It is evident that the participants of the present study exploited the sociopragmatic norms of their native culture as reflected in their responses to the English WDCTs. The participants have employed this strategy in their responses to situation 3 where the addressees were addressed as equal in status with the respondents.

To conclude the above discussion, it was found that the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer was primarily used to mainstream the strategies of in/direct discourse during the accomplishment of the selected speech acts. The participants could not do so without the norms of their respective mother tongues which could be

clearly seen in their performance integrating the mother tongue norms into the target language. Likewise, it was observed that pragmatic transfer occurred in the form of sociopragmatic transfer which was used as a resource to accomplish different communicative acts. In short, the findings of the study clearly indicate that pragmatic transfer hampers the ability of the learners to acquire a balanced pragmatic proficiency in the target language. The present study demonstrates that the participants hampered pragmatic competence is an outcome of their negative sociopragmatic transfer.

7.3 Data Triangulation

The study was based on three data collection tools, viz. WDCTs, open role plays and semi-structured interviews. Keeping the logic of data triangulation in consideration, it is necessary to triangulate the data from these three tools. As mentioned earlier that a pilot study was carried out to examine and validate the authenticity of the written and spoken mode of data. Moreover, the results obtained from WDCTs stand identical with the results obtained from open role plays. Slight differences were found in the results which did not stand significant. In this regard, there are less grammatical mistakes in the written data as compared with spoken utterances. Thus, the participants remained more conscious in their responses to WDCTs while natural expressions were made in the case of open role plays. Therefore, the written responses of the participants did not exactly correspond to what they actually said in the same setting and situation during open role plays. In other words, the results obtained from WDCTs were similar to open role plays because both direct and indirect strategies were employed during the accomplishment of the selected speech acts. As a common characteristic of these two data collection tools, it has been observed that different variables, such as the situation, politeness factors, gender and age of the participants, or their proficiency level, can be controlled. In contrast to interviews which were audio-recorded, WDCTs stand comparatively insignificant because much valid results have been obtained from interviews that were elicited through prompts during interview sessions. The data collected through face-to-face interviews concerns the facts about the similarities and differences in the realization of the selected speech acts in the target language and mother tongue that support the results obtained from WDCTs. Hence, a kind of control over the

production of speech acts has been observed in WDCTs that seems a little artificial or unnatural.

As far as the second data collection tool is concerned, it was observed that the results of open oral role plays were almost similar to WDCTs though the mode of data collection was different. Although there was a similarity in content, the utterances which were orally made were more spontaneous and natural. Thus, the participants maintained more natural expressions during open role plays as it involved a face to-face interaction between two interlocutors than written production techniques. In contrast to interviews, it was found that participants remained less vocal in their responses to open role plays. Though a slight hesitation was felt at the participants' end due to the presence of audio-recorder but they managed with it after they were ensured about the confidentiality of their identity.

The results of semi-structured interviews were compared with WDCTs, and it was found that the participants were more conscious regarding the use of language in WDCTs whereas they remained much natural and extemporaneous in their expressions during interview sessions. The interview sessions, thus, validated the results obtained through WDCTs. In fact, there was a significant difference between spoken and written mode of data as participants remained more expressive in spoken data. WDCTS when compared with open role plays, there was a close similarity in the results which validated the results obtained from these two data collection tools.

7.4 Discussion

In the choice of strategy to be used for the accomplishment of the selected speech acts, the two groups exhibited important similarities and differences. Participants from both the groups used mostly conventionally indirect (henceforth, CI) strategies to accomplish the speech acts of request, apology and refusal in the present study. Both groups used indirect requests frequently. However, PSELL group used a certain direct sub-strategy (the Want statement) more frequently than SSELL group. However, the participants did not manage successfully to choose an appropriate strategy when their ability to do so depended on responsiveness to the development of discourse. The participants sometimes chose a strategy in terms of social variables which was not appropriate at that particular point during the development of the interaction. Moreover, the requesting behaviour of these

participants indicated several repercussions for the reasons of interlanguage pragmatic behaviour. Most evidently, it approves the controversy (Kasper 1992; Takahashi, 1996) that a pluricausal elucidation for ILP phenomena is the most considerable one. This study also pointed out a significant role of negative transfer from the LI in the case of PSELL group respondents. This factor tends to receive little attention in ILP studies (Kasper 1992); however, it appears to be a major cause of a large number of important features of requesting behaviour by these English learners. Their native-like selection of the query preparatory request type as their main request strategy is probably largely explicable by transfer of LI knowledge.

Their ability to vary request strategies appropriately by situation seems attributable largely to transfer of LI knowledge about the appropriacy or non-appropriacy of given request types in given contexts; however, at least one element of this ability, their native-like sensitivity to the factor of urgency in selecting IFID, could be due to either LI knowledge or universal knowledge, in the light of CCSARP findings (Blum-Kulka & House 1989) that native speakers of majority of languages differ their choice of request strategy in different ways, it appears that a large amount of knowledge about situational variation in strategy choice may be universal. Moreover, the results of this study found some significant differences between these two groups of English learners. Pashtu learners of English used more alerters as attention getters and locution derivable strategies than Saraiki speakers in requests while Saraiki speakers used more explanation in apologies. The non-native speakers' use of alerters confirms most studies on interlanguage pragmatics (Fukushima, 1990; Koike 1989; Trosborg, 1987) stated that native speakers of English use more politeness markers than non-native speakers, who tend to be more direct. The learners' over repeated use of alerters in requests are alike with previous findings such as (Faerch & Kasper 1989) and could be expounded both as transference from mother tongue into the target language, and most obviously as characteristic of learners' interlanguage. It is systematic in the sense that it is consistently underpinned by culture-specific patterns, which can be explained by a complex synthesis of factors -- historical, cultural, philosophical, social, political, ethical, and educational. I believe that we must go beyond the first language transfer theory to account for this complicated Chinese indirectness in English writing.

The strategy was employed as a solidarity marker and displays interest in the other wants. The participants elaborated one uncertainty about their ability to convey

meaning clearly, manifested in their tendency to ‘play it safe’ by using a lot of words to realize speech acts, and to choose “explicit, transparent, unambiguous means of expression” as goes similar to Faerch and Kasper (1989, p. 245). Kecskes and Papp (2000) pointed out that the accomplishment of speech acts in a cross-linguistic and cross-cultural setting affects the pattern of discourse during production as well as comprehension in the target language. The present study is a mere step forward in researching the interlanguage of Saraiki and Pashtu English language learners at the level of sociopragmatic transfer. This is in line with the findings of Al-Eryani (2007) who studied how Yemeni performed refusals, and Ghazanfari, et.al (2013) who have investigated the speech act of refusal through the lens of cross-linguistic differences among native Persian and English speakers, and Asmali (2013) who studied the refusals made by three groups of nonnative speakers of English.

Most importantly, in contrast to the results of the study conducted in the recent past, the researcher of the present study found the results in line with the research conducted by Maros, Shboul and Yasin (2014) who observed refusal strategies between Jordanian EFL learners and Malaysian ESL learners. They exposed that the participants had shown overwhelming response by using an indirect strategy in making a refusal. It is pertinent to mention that the present study validates their findings. Likewise, other scholars such as Umale (2011) studied refusal strategies used by British and Omani interlocutors. It was found in the study that both the British and the Omanis tended to use an indirect strategy in refusing someone’s request, particularly when encountered with higher status people. While in the present study, it is also true that both the groups were indirect in rejecting someone’s request holding higher status. Istifci (2009) also recommends that advanced learners have the capability to act in the target language norms to some degree.

The different linguistic expressions used by the two groups are in good accordance with the different sociopragmatic characteristics of the situations. The usage of preparatory as a request strategy depends less on contextual factors and confirms the extended use of this strategy (Kasper 1989). The analysis of apologies confirms previous findings (Bergman & Kasper, 1993) in which the severity of the offense does not imply the assumption of responsibility. Accordingly, the present study apprehended questions concerning the mode of in/directness in the accomplishment of the speech acts of apology, requests and refusals by Pashtu and Saraiki speakers learning English as L2. Likewise, the preferred strategy of both the

groups for the execution of indirect requests is similar to the descriptions, and a propensity has been shown for conventionally indirect requests (e.g., Abuarrah et al., 2013; Blum-Kulka et al., 1989). The results revealed that the PSELL group of Pashtu speakers followed more direct and indirect strategies in the accomplishment of the selected speech acts than the SSELL group of Saraiki speakers as used by English speakers is in line with (reported in Abuarrah et al., 2013; Tawalbeh & Al-Oqaily, 2012), among others. Furthermore, the study shows that the learners of L2 English are relatively more calculated in the production of requests and thus opposes the findings of Jordà (2003), Soler and Jorda (2007), and Safont-Jordà and Alcon (2012) that PSELL and SSELL group learners of English are somewhat close to native speakers in the appropriate use of English requests. The Saraiki speakers displayed a greater (formal and informal) acquaintance to English pragmatic norms and were found possessing a relatively higher level of pragmatic competence than the Pashtu speakers.

With respect to an approach of directness in refusals, there was no substantial difference between the two groups in their choice of opting for either direct or indirect refusals, or both preferred indirect refusals. Similarly, neither Pashtu participants nor Saraiki participants among English language learners could be viewed as more closely observant in their pragmatic behaviour of the norms of target language. In contrast to the studies which stated inclination for production of English indirect refusals in both groups as true to Arabic speakers in the studies conducted by (Al-Eryani, 2007; Al-Issa & Oudji, 1998; Morkus, 2009), Nelson et al. (2002) who demonstrated that refusals in L1 Iraqi Arabic and L1 American English were equally direct/indirect. The participants of both the groups in the current study endorsed Nelson's findings and can be supposed to explain L1 group's level of directness in English refusals as analogous. Thus, the two groups used negative transfer of their L1 directness strategies for refusals in English. However, the previous studies on the speech act of refusal have sharply marked the use of more indirect strategies than the native speakers (AlEryani, 2007; AlIssa, 2003; Morkus, 2009) or suggest the application of an equal number direct/indirect strategies as the native speakers (Nelson et al., 2002).

According to one of the Saraiki participants, refusals constitute different feelings in both cultures. During the interview session, he said: "I feel convenient with saying 'no' to people in English, it feels like I'm not offending them. In Saraiki culture, people say 'no' more easily than the people in Pashtun culture as Pashtuns

regard it as a severe offence.” The participants also employed strategies that softened the force of refusals by providing explanations to save their interlocutors’ face. This finding is parallel to the finding by Ekmekci (2015), which resulted in negative pragmatic transfer from their L1. To sum up, the participants negatively transferred their native cultural norms (i.e., the use of reason/explanation as an indirect refusal) into the L2. With this point, the need for instruction on socio-pragmatic features of L2 in ESL classroom becomes imperative since simply immersing in the target language is shown to be insufficient. In sharp contrast to the results of this study, Chen and Li (2016) found that the transfer effects of mother tongue on the learning of L2 of Chinese English learners. In the aforementioned study, analyzes the transfer in word, sentence and writing mechanism. The transfer of Chinese in English can be both positive and negative. The transfer of Chinese can also play a positive role in English writings. However, compared with negative transfer, the positive effect of Chinese is not so obvious.

7.5 Summary

It was found that the learners of English language relied on the linguistic resources of their mother tongue and incorporated those linguistic and cultural elements by using pragmatic transfer as a resource in accomplishing the selected speech acts. In a nutshell, the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer affected the pragmatic competence of the learners rather it led the participants to incorporate the pragmatic and cultural norms into the target language. Moreover, the participants relied on the social norms of their mother tongue and transported them into the target language.

To conclude the above discussion, it was found that the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer was primarily used to mainstream the strategies of in/direct discourse during the accomplishment of the selected speech acts. The participants could not do so without the norms of their respective mother tongues which could be clearly seen in their performance integrating the mother tongue norms into the target language. Likewise, it was revealed that pragmatic transfer occurred in the form of sociopragmatic transfer which was used as a resource to accomplish different communicative acts. In short, the findings of the study clearly indicate that the involvement of pragmatic transfer hampers the ability of the learners to acquire a balanced pragmatic proficiency in the target language. The present study

demonstrates that the participants hampered pragmatic competence is an outcome of their negative sociopragmatic transfer.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study set out to investigate the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer among Pashtu and Saraiki English language learners. Furthermore, it aimed at investigating the strategies of directness and indirectness adopted by the participants during the accomplishment of the three selected speech acts, viz. apology, request and refusal. The study also aimed at investigating the effect of pragmatic transfer on the pragmatic competence of the selected English language learners. Employing Kasper's (1992) framework of pragmatic transfer, the study used three data collection tools, namely: written discourse completion tasks (WDCTs), oral open role-plays and semi-structured interviews.

The study sought answers to the following research questions:

1. What specific in/direct discourse strategies the Saraiki and Pashtu English language learners transfer from their mother tongue to the target language (English)?
2. Why do the Saraiki and Pashtu English language learners use pragmatic transfer as a resource for accomplishing different communicative tasks in the target language?
3. How does pragmatic transfer affect the pragmatic competence of the selected ESL learners in the target language?

As far as the answer to the first research question is concerned, the results of the study showed that the participants of both the groups displayed their linguistic abilities and executed the required speech acts through employing mostly indirect strategies. However, it was found that the participants from PSELL group used IFID as a strategy during the accomplishment of the speech acts of apology. It was found that the participants were using direct strategy as a part of their cultural practice in a high-status context because Pashtu participants then consider it an offence if explanations are provided over the committed offence. It was true with them while using direct strategies because provision of explanations and reasons is then regarded as an offence. The strategy of repair is cautiously used by both the groups. In this regard, the PSELL participants have used it to strengthen the force of apology. On the other hand, it was that SSELLgroup participants remained indirect in the accomplishment of the speech acts of apology by providing reasons and explanations over the committed offence which is highly acknowledged in the SSELL group culture. The most frequent indirect strategy employed by the participants was giving

reasons and explanations. It was revealed that SSELL group participants have used very less IFID which is a direct discourse strategy because in SSELL culture it is necessary to provide enough explanation and reason for seeking the apology over a committed offence. The strategy of repair is frequently and intensively used by SSELL group participants in a high-status context. During the accomplishment of the speech acts of request, it was found that both the groups have used simultaneously direct strategies to a lesser extent than indirect ones. Among these direct strategies though less imperatives are used but hedged performative as a direct strategy has been overtly used by the participants of both the groups. Other direct strategies of Goal and want statements were used in equal proportion by the participants of both the groups. As mentioned earlier that in the accomplishment of the speech acts of request both the groups have employed mostly indirect strategies that are carried out through the indirect strategy of ability or permission that are categorized as conventionally direct requests. Among the non-conventionally indirect strategies, question hint has been used frequently in order to mitigate the force of the accomplished speech act of request.

In the accomplishment of the speech acts of refusal, it was traced out that indirect strategies are precisely used by both the groups. Among these, the strategy of providing an explanation and reason that showed the inability of the requestee to refuse a request. Further, the strategy of indirect regret was used, for example, I'm sorry, thank you for the invitation. In the same way, the strategy of the pre-refusals that initiate the refusal negotiation and prepare the addressee for forthcoming refusal (e.g., that sounds fun). In a direct strategy (e.g., no, I can't) of a refusal was present using the performative verbs. However, it was revealed that the PSELL participants have used more indirect strategies during the accomplishment of the speech acts of refusal because the participants have used such expressions that lessen the force of the refusal in order to avoid face threatening act. Following these findings, it can be concluded that the accomplishment of the speech acts via in/direct discourse strategies showed their reliance upon mother tongue cultural norms which cannot be violated in the use of the target language. In the same way, these strategies are borrowed from the mother tongue cultural norms, and are further integrated into the target language. Hence, it is evident that both groups employed specific direct and indirect discourse strategies which are transmitted through pragmatic transfer from mother tongue and

are embedded into the target language during the accomplishment of different communicative acts.

In response to the second research question, the findings of the study revealed that a type of sociopragmatic transfer was found that it creates an ease in the learning process of English. Furthermore, pragmatic transfer has been used by both the groups equally during the accomplishment of the speech acts. It was revealed that pragmatic transfer takes place in the learning process of English language. Not only that pragmatic transfer creates an ease for learners but it also helps them to broaden their pragmatic competence in the target language. The phenomenon of pragmatic transfer occurred due to mother tongue interference and showed a slight inclination to what is known as pragmalinguistic transfer incorporated in their utterances with some English words. The pragmatic transfer is used as a resource during the accomplishment of the selected speech acts of the study that generates new ways for learners to be proficient in English. Thus, sociopragmatic transfer creates an ease for the learners in learning English to acquire a certain level of pragmatic competence of the target language. Hence, the negative transfer of mother tongue had an impact on the performance of the participants while using the target language ensures a satisfactory answer to question no. 2. At same time, it was observed among PSELL participants who rely more on the use of pragmatic transfer than the SSELL group because of their inefficiency to execute a speech act following the target language norms. It was interesting to notice that the mother tongue equivalents in L2 were mixed into their English answers in different situations using pragmatic transfer as a resource to generate different pragmatic effects. Similarly, the phenomenon of sociopragmatic transfer could be endorsed to the admired status of the English language found among Pakistani university students. It also may be an outcome of English language learners across the world to impress others which seems of being sophisticated and educated. Most importantly, the influence of participants' mother tongue cultural norms was displayed in the form of sociopragmatic transfer. Hence, it proves that the phenomenon encourages the learners to use pragmatic transfer as a resource to create an ease in learning process of the target language.

As far as the answer to the third research questionis concerned which focused on the effects of pragmatic transfer, it was found that the PSELL group participants were unable to express themselves in the target language norms independently. As the mother tongue interference causes difficulties for learners to achieve a pragmatic

proficiency in the target language that is why the PSELL participants have relied more on the use of mother tongue cultural norms. Moreover, it was found among the PSELL group participants that the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer resulting in negative sociopragmatic transfer hampered the ability of the learners to learn the target language independently. Thus, it was evident from the responses of the participants that pragmatic transfer affects the pragmatic competence of the learners because mother tongues cultural norms are not applicable at all to the norms of the target language. In a nutshell, the SSELL group participants were found more competent who have achieved a balanced proficiency in the target language. The same was revealed during interview sessions that learners relied on the social norms of their mother tongue in the execution of different speech acts in English. Thus, according to the participants, pragmatic transfer created an ease in the learning of English and helped in acquiring a balanced proficiency in the target language.

8.1 Conclusion

This study investigated the influence of mother tongue cultural norms found among the Pashtu and Saraiki speakers learning English as target language in Pakistani university students in the realization of the speech acts such as apologies, requests and refusals in English. It attempted to determine and analyze occurrences of sociopragmatic transfer in the participants' production of the speech act in English. Moreover, it seems that in the beginning, the greatest significance has been given to the form of the language in English as second language or foreign language (henceforth, ESL/EFL) settings. At present, as the communicative approach has become more appreciated and widely acknowledged in language learning settings, the attention has moved towards the enhancement of communicative competence, which comprises pragmatic competence of the learners. Thus, a particular attention has been paid to pragmatics and studies on speech acts in ILP.

This study showed that both the groups participants' intuition might not be accurate as the participants do not remain conscious when performing speech acts. However, it is not guaranteed that naturally-occurring corpora are really available to put in use as a source of speech act information to account for various contexts learners are likely to encounter, especially in the case of sensitive ones like apologies, requests and refusals. In case of the present study, in terms of the realization of the

speech acts of request, apology and refusal emphasize the following points as a concluding note.

Modal elements are used which are important as they have a pragmatic consequence, and more focus is made on one's ability (can and could) and willingness (would) that learners seem to overlearn. Secondly, modal verbs are used as an appropriate way to open a request. It has been shown that how the requester's attention can be drawn, especially in informal settings showing that the discourse marker please is not always an apt choice. Furthermore, discourse markers should not be over represented to avoid overgeneralization in IL production, such as in the case with 'please' that should appear in proximity with downtoners. Most importantly, request was closed using thanking expressions and appreciators. The study also showed an employment of independent strategies, namely: imposition minimisers and apologies in power-asymmetric, distance and high-imposition encounters in refusal particularly. The presentation of apologies formed by means of a context-appropriate single IFID stands significant among the participants. The study highlighted the host of functions IFIDs can serve in different contexts whether offered for real apologies (offenses) in the case of I'm sorry or for formulaic ones (attention cues) in the case of excuse me/pardon me. Finally, the notions of private-self vs. public-self and individualism vs. collectivism that characterize the mother and the target cultures should be brought to the consciousness of the learners. All these points come under sociopragmatic factors.

8.2 Recommendations for Teaching English as a Second/Foreign Language

The specific issue of advanced learners of English needs to be thoroughly investigated so that the instructors can achieve the target in these areas to teach and display a better pragmatic competence in their classrooms. In order to teach in a better method, it is essential to realize the cultural differences and pragmatic patterns of the languages so that teachers must focus on this specific area of teaching. Development of pragmatic competence is an approach to assist learners in order to overcome such problem. The teachers of English shall raise an awareness among English language learners about cultural differences which facilitates them to distinguish the pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic features of foreign languages and thus could be able to produce adequate pragmatic features.

In a nutshell, the teaching of the sociopragmatic dimension of speech acts to EFL learners is reminiscent of the statement of Thomas (1983) that it could be culturally sensitive as it entails implementing a new system of beliefs. It is important to draw the attention of EFL pedagogy to look for a learner-friendly way to teach the host culture's beliefs. ELT teaching material is often criticized for centering attention on linguistic chunks and decontextualized notions instead of offering opportunities for raising cross-cultural awareness through discussion of cross-cultural differences, analysis of interactions and comparison of pragmatic behaviour in L1 and TL and reflexive comments on them.

8.3 Recommendations for English Language Learners

In conclusion, it is argued that the occurrence of negative sociopragmatic transfer can be tackled only by giving the student the utensils to make the procedures of pragmatic decision-making obvious. Warning learners to assume cross-cultural differences in the linguistic realizations of politeness, truthfulness, etc., takes the teaching of language beyond the domains of an ordinary training and makes it justly educational. It is important for learners to understand the strategies employed through pragmatic principles could be activated in other cultures. Moreover, the learners shall have the knowledge to make a knowledgeable choice and permitting her/him the freedom to ignore pragmatic conventions, is the way to acknowledge her/himself indicating independence and freedom of choice and to respect her/his system of ethics and beliefs. Thus, learners who feel that their world view is being ignored or who show inability to express themselves as they wish are hardly likely to establish positive attitudes towards learning a foreign language.

8.4 Limitations of the Study and Recommendations for Future Research

The study, which falls in the periphery of cross-cultural pragmatics, stays limited to three speech acts of apology, request and refusal. Further, it is limited only to Pashtu and Saraiki speakers learning English as a second language. The study is a further step in the study of ILP of Pakistani EFL learners. It can be duplicated through shifting the focus to other related aspects, as this area of research offers various avenues meant to be explored. Further research investigating the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer will prove beneficial for a broader understanding of the phenomenon at large. Also, each semantic formula for speech acts can be investigated

individually and learners' performances can be investigated through conducting longitudinal studies with ESL learners belonging to other speech communities, such as: Punjabi and Sindhi etc.

The present study suggests the following areas that can be explored in future researches:

- The occurrence of pragmatic transfer in the realization of speech acts other than the ones explored in this study can be investigated, e.g., compliments, invitations and offers.
- The effects of pragmatic instruction using a longitudinal study can be investigated that assess the performance of the foreign language learners before, during, and after they receive pragmatic instruction.
- A longitudinal study can be carried out on how and through what stages the learners of English as a foreign language acquire and develop pragmatic competence.
- An investigation of the phenomenon of the reverse transfer and its causes can be addressed.
- A study that differentiates between positive and negative pragmatic transfer among English as second language learners can be conducted.

The present study is a step ahead in the area of interlanguage pragmatics of Pakistani ESL learners. It is limited regarding a couple of aspects. In order to have a clearer image of the ILP of EFL learners, other variables need to be investigated, such as: context-external factors for instance, age and gender, context-internal factors legitimacy to request or obligation to apologize, non-structural elements, such as learning instruction, learning context (ESL or EFL) and the length of residence in the target community. Also, psycholinguistic aspects of discourse participants recommend exploring other domains which are the perception and the development of the requestive and apologizing strategies in learners ILP as well as the communicative effects of their deviated production. Moreover, it is also recommended to conduct cross-cultural and interlanguage studies using larger samples of participants from different backgrounds. To sharpen an understanding of the interlanguage phenomenon at the pragmatic level, there is a need for comprehensive cross-cultural studies that bring together L1 and TL cultures.

As a concluding note, it is important for the learners to achieve a reasonable standard of pragmatic competence in the target language. It is possible only if more consideration is paid to the study of pragmatics while teaching English as a target language in Pakistani classrooms. There is still a long way to go which requires some serious steps to be taken for creating an urge within learners to improve their pragmatic competence in English in a systematic manner.

REFERENCES

- Abuarrah, S., Lochman, K., & Lutjerhams, M. (2013). Cross cultural pragmatics requests' use of strategy and level of directness in Palestinian Arabic and British English. *An-Najah University Journal for Research (Humanities)*, 27(5), 1109–1144.
- Adefiza, B., & Jones, J. (2013). Investigating apology response strategies in Australian English and Bahasa Indonesia. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 36(1), 71–101. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ara1.36.1.04jon>
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. W. (2008). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Aitchinson, J. (2003). *Words in the Mind: An introduction to the mental lexicon* (3rd ed). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Al-Ali, M. N., & Alawneh, R. (2010). Linguistic mitigating devices in American and Jordanian students' requests. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 7(2), 311–339.
- Al-Eryani, A. A. (2007). Refusal strategies by Yemeni EFL learners. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 9(2), 19–34.
- Al-Gahtani, S. & Alkahtani, S. A. (2012). Request strategies by second language learners of English: Pre- and post-head act strategies. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 5(2), 16–28.
- Al-Issa, A. S. (2003). *Sociopragmatic transfer in the performance of refusals by Jordanian EFL learners: Evidence and motivating factors*. UMI Dissertation Services.
- Alcón, E., & Safont Jordà, M. P. (2012). Multilingualism and English. In C. Creswell (Ed.). *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Al-Issa, I., & Oudji, S. H. A. H. I. N. (1998). Culture and anxiety disorders. *Cultural clinical psychology: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 127–51.
- Asmali, M. (2013). Cross-cultural comparison of non-native speakers' refusal strategies in English. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*, 1(3), 111–135.
- Al-Shboul, Y., & Maros, M. (2013). Condolences strategies by Jordanians to an obituary status update on Facebook. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*, 13(3), 151–162.

- Al-Issa, A. (2003). Sociocultural transfer in L2 speech behaviors: Evidence and motivating factors. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27(5), 581–601.
- Al-Issa, A. S. (2003). *Sociopragmatic transfer in the performance of refusals by Jordanian EFL learners: Evidence and motivating factors*. UMI Dissertation Services.
- Asif, S. & Imtiaz (2005). *Saraiki: A sociolinguistic study of language desertion*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Lancaster.
- Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do things with words* (Vol. 88). Oxford University Press.
- Bachman, L. F. & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 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. (1999). Researching method. *Pragmatics and Language Learning*, 9, 237–264.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1999). From morpheme studies to temporal semantics: Tense-aspect research in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21(3), 341–382.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Mahan-Taylor, R. (2003). *Teaching pragmatics*. Washington DC: US Department of State Office of English Language Programs.
- Beebe, L. M., & Takahashi, T. (1989). Sociolinguistic variation in face-threatening speech acts. In *The dynamic interlanguage* (pp. 199–218). Springer, Boston, MA.
- Takahashi, S., & Beebe, L. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R. Scarcella, S. Krashen and E. Anderson (Eds). *Developing Communicative Competence in a Second Language* (pp. 55-73). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Beebe, L. M., Takahashi, T., Uliss-Weltz, R., Scarcella, R., Andersen, E., & Krashen, S. D. (1990). Developing communicative competence in a second language. Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R. C., Scarcella, E. S., Andersen, & S. D. Krashen, (Eds.). *Developing Communicative Competence in a Second Language*. New York: Newbury House.

- Beebe, L. M., & Cummings, M. C. (2009). Natural speech act data versus written questionnaire data: How data collection method affects speech act performance. In R. C. Scarella, E. Andersen and S. C. Krashen (Eds.). *Speech Acts Across Cultures* (pp. 65-88). De Gruyter Mouton.
- Bergman, M. L., & Kasper, G. (1993). Perception and performance in native and nonnative apology. *Interlanguage pragmatics*, 4(1), 82–107.
- Bergman, M. L., & Kasper, G. (1993). The interlanguage of apologizing: Cross-cultural evidence. *University of Hawai'i Working Papers in English as a Second Language*, 10(2), 82–107.
- Bialystok, E. (1993). Metalinguistic awareness: The development of children's representations of language. In C. Pratt & A. Garton (Eds.), *Systems of Representation in Children: Development and Use* (pp. 211– 233). London: Wiley Blackwell.
- Biesenbach-Lucas, S. (2007). Students writing emails to faculty: An examination of e-politeness among native and non-native speakers of English. *Language Learning and Technology* 11(2), 59–81.
- Billmyer, K., & Varghese, M. (2000). Investigating instrument-based pragmatic variability: Effects of enhancing discourse completion tests. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(4), 517–552.
- Bley-Vroman, R. (1983). The comparative fallacy in interlanguage studies: the case of systematicity 1. *Language Learning*, 33(1), 1–17.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1980). Learning to say what you mean in a second language: A study of the speech act performance of learners of Hebrew as a second language 1. *Applied Linguistics*, 3(1), 29–59
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1983). The dynamics of political interviews. *Text-Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 3(2), 131–154.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1987). Indirectness and politeness in requests: Same or different? *Journal of pragmatics*, 11(2), 131–146.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1991). Interlanguage pragmatics: The case of requests. In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood-Smith, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign/second language pedagogy research* (pp. 255-272). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). Investigating cross-cultural pragmatics: An introductory overview. *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*, 31, 1–34.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). The CCSARP Coding Manual. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 273–294). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (Vol. 31). Ablex.
- Blum, S., & Levenston, E. A. (1978). Universals of lexical simplification. *Language learning*, 28(2), 399–415.
- Blum-Kulka, S., & Levenston, E. A. (1987). Lexical-grammatical pragmatic indicators. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 9(2), 155–170.
- 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., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Pragmatics and second language learning: Preface. *Applied Linguistics*, 5(3), 187–188.
- Blum-Kulka, S., & Sheffer, H. (1993). The metapragmatic discourse of American-Israeli families at dinner. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (eds.). *Interlanguage Pragmatics* (pp. 196–223). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bou-Franch, P. (2011). Openings and closings in Spanish email conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(6), 1772–1785.
- Bou-Franch, P. (2012). Pragmatic transfer. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*.
- Brown, P., & Fraser, C. (1979). Speech as a marker of situation. In *Social Markers in Speech* (pp. 33–62). Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage.
- Campillo, P. S., Jordà, M. P. S., & Espurz, V. C. (2009). Refusal strategies: A proposal from a sociopragmatic approach. *RAEL: revista electrónica de lingüística aplicada*, 8, 139–150.
- Carson, J. E., & Kuehn, P. A. (1994). Evidence of transfer and loss in developing second language writers. *Bilingual Performance in Reading and Writing*, 1, 257–281.

- Carson, J. E., Carrell, P. L., Silberstein, S., Kroll, B., & Kuehn, P. A. (1990). Reading-writing relationships in first and second language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24(2), 245–266.
- Catford, J. C. (1964). Phonation types: The classification of some laryngeal components of speech production. In David Abercrombie, D. B. Fry, P. A. D. MacCarthy, N. C. Scott & J. L. M. Trim (eds.) *In honour of Daniel Jones* (26–37). London: Longmans.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Issues in Applied Linguistics Authors Model with Content Specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 5–35.
- Cha, M. (2007). The use of communication strategies in international business settings. *현대영어교육*, 8(2), 20–40.
- Chen, J. (1995). *Metapragmatic judgments on refusals: Its reliability and consistency*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 391381).
- Chen, Y. H., & Li, X. L. (2016). *Effects of L1 Transfer on English Writing of Chinese EFL Students*. *Cross-Cultural Communication*, 12(4), 50–53. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/8281>
- Chen, I. J. (2017). Face-threatening Acts: Conflict between a teacher and students in EFL Classroom. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 7(2), 151–166.
- Chomsky, N. (1969). *Deep structure, surface structure, and semantic interpretation*. Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Clyne, M., Ball, M., & Neil, D. (1991). Intercultural communication at work in Australia: Complaints and apologies in turns. *Multilingua-Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 10(3), 251–274.
- Coe, R. M., & Shuzhong, H. (1989). A Preliminary Study of Contrastive Rhetorical Patterns in English and Chinese [J]. *Journal of Foreign Languages*, 2, 40–46.
- Cohen, A. D., & Olshtain, E. (1981). Developing a measure of sociocultural competence: The case of apology 1. *Language Learning*, 31(1), 113–134.
- Cohen, A. D., Olshtain, E., & Rosenstein, D. S. (1986). Advanced EFL apologies: what remains to be learned?. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 62, 51–74.

- Cohen, A. D., & Brooks-Carson, A. (2001). Research on direct vs. translated writing processes: Implications for assessment. *Modern Language Journal*, 85(2), 169–188.
- Cohen, W., Carvalho, V., & Mitchell, T. (2004). Learning to classify email into “Speech Acts.” In *Proc. EMNLP-2004*, 309–316.
- Cohen, A. D. (2014). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. London: Routledge.
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learner's errors. *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 5(1-4), 161–170.
- Creswell, J. W., Plano Clark, V. L., Gutmann, M., & Hanson, W. (2003). Advanced mixed methods research designs. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research* (pp. 209–240). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Crystal, T. H., & House, A. S. (1988). Segmental durations in connected-speech signals: Current results. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 83(4), 1553–1573.
- Cummins, J. (1983). Language proficiency and academic achievement. Issues in language testing research. In C. Rivera (Ed.). *Language Proficiency and Academic Achievement* (108-130). Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (1983). *Heritage language education: A literature review*. Publication Sales, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 252 Bloor St. West, Toronto, Ontario M5S 1V6 Canada.
- Cummins, J. (1989). Language and literacy acquisition in bilingual contexts. *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development*, 10(1), 17–31.
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire* (Vol. 23). Multilingual Matters.
- Cunningham, D. J. (2017). Methodological innovation for the study of request production in telecollaboration. *Language Learning & Technology*, 21(1), 76–99.
- Danesi, M. (1995). Learning and teaching languages: The role of “conceptual fluency”. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), 3–20.
- Daskalovska, N., Ivanovska, B., Kusevska, M., & Ulanska, T. (2016). The Use of Request Strategies by EFL Learners. *Proceeding of the International*

Conference on Teaching and Learning English as an Additional Language, Antalya, Turkey.

- David, C. (1997). *English as a global language*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- DeCapua, A. (1989). *An analysis of pragmatic transfer in the speech act of complaints as produced by native speakers of German in English* (Doctoral dissertation, UMI).
- De Castro Salgado, L. C., Leitão, C. F., & De Souza, C. S. (2012). *A journey through cultures: metaphors for guiding the design of cross-cultural interactive systems*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- De Castro, E. B. V. (2012). *Cosmological perspectivism in Amazonia and elsewhere*. HAU Journal of Ethnographic Theory.
- Deng, J., Walker, G. J., & Swinnerton, G. (2006). A comparison of environmental values and attitudes between Chinese in Canada and Anglo-Canadians. *Environment and Behavior*, 38(1), 22–47.
- Duan, A. W., & Wannaruk, A. (2008). The comparison between written DCT and oral roleplays in investigation upon English refusal strategies by Chinese EFL students. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 5(10), 8–18.
- Duff, P. A. (2002). The discursive co-construction of knowledge, identity, and difference: An ethnography of communication in the high school mainstream. *Applied linguistics*, 23(3), 289–322.
- Duff, P. A. (2008). Language socialization, participation and identity: Ethnographic approaches. In *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 860–872). Springer, Boston, MA.
- Dulay, H. (1982). *Language two*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Dulay, H., & Burt, M. (1975). Creative construction in second language learning and teaching. *TESOL*, 75, 21–32.
- Dulay, H. C., & Burt, M. K. (1972). Goofing: An indicator of children's second language learning strategies 1. *Language learning*, 22(2), 235–252.
- Economidou-Kogetsidis, M. (2008). Internal and external mitigation in interlanguage requests production: The case of Greek learners of English. *Journal of Politeness Research* 4(1): 111–138.
- Economidou-Kogetsidis, Maria. (2012). Modifying oral requests in a foreign language: The case of Greek Cypriot learners of English. In M. Economidou-

- Koetsidis, & H. Woodfield (eds.), *Interlanguage Request Modification* (163–201). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Economidou-Koetsidis, M. (2013). Strategies, modification and perspective in native speakers' requests: A comparison of WDCT and naturally-occurring requests. *Journal of Pragmatics* 53(1): 21–38.
- Eckman, F. R. (1977). Markedness and the contrastive analysis hypothesis. *Language Learning*, 27(2), 315–330.
- Eisner, E. (1992). Objectivity in educational research. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 22(1), 9–15.
- Eisner, E. W. (1992). Curriculum ideologies. In P.W. Jackson (Eds.) *Handbook of Research on Curriculum* (pp. 302–426). New York: Macmillan.
- EKMEKÇİ, E. (2015). Native and non-native English instructors' production of refusals and complaints: a preliminary case study in a state university in turkey. *Journal of International Social Research*, 8(39).
- Ekmekci, E. (2015). Native and Non-Native English Instructors Production of Refusals and Complaints: A Preliminary Case Study in a State University in Turkey. *Jisr Journal of International Social Research*, 8(39), 613–621.
- Ellis, G. (1996). How culturally appropriate is the communicative approach?. *ELT journal*, 50(3), 213–218.
- Ellis, R., & Ellis, R. R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1994). A theory of instructed second language acquisition. In N. Ellis, N. (Ed.), *Implicit and Explicit Learning of Languages* (, pp. 79–114). London: Academic Press.
- Ellis, R. (1994). Factors in the incidental acquisition of second language vocabulary from oral input: A review essay. *Applied Language Learning*, 5(1), 1–32.
- Erickson, F., & Shultz, J. J. (1982). *The counselor as gatekeeper: Social interaction in interviews. Language, thought, and culture*. New York: Academic Press.
- Erickson, F. (1975). Gatekeeping and the melting pot: Interaction in counseling encounters. *Harvard educational review*, 45(1), 44–70.
- Erickson, F. (2011). One function of proxemic shifts in face-to-face interaction. In A. Kendon, R. Harris, M., & M. R. Key (Eds.). *Organization of behavior in face-to-face interaction* (pp. 175-188). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

- Erickson, F. (1975). One function of proxemic shifts in face-to-face interaction. *Organization of Behavior in Face-to-Face Interaction*, 175–187.
- Ethnologue, G. B. F. (2009). Languages of the World.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1984). Two ways of defining communication strategies. *Language learning*, 34(1), 45–63.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1984). Pragmatic knowledge: Rules and procedures. *Applied Linguistics*, 5(3), 214–225.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1987). Perspectives on Language Transfer. *Applied Linguistics*, 8(2), 111–36.
- Færch, C., & Kasper, G. (1987). From product to process: Introspective methods in second language research. In C. Færch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Introspection in second language research* (pp. 5–23). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Faerch, C., Kasper, G. (1989). Internal and external modification in interlanguage request realization. In Shoshana Blum-Kulka, Juliane House & Gabriele Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural Pragmatics* (pp. 221–247), Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Fagan, E. R., & Cheong, P. (1987). Contrastive rhetoric: Pedagogical implications for the ESL teacher in Singapore. *RELC Journal*, 18(1), 19–30.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2004). Interlanguage refusals: Linguistic politeness and length of residence in the target community. *Language learning*, 54(4), 587–653.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. César. (2007). Pragmatic development in the Spanish as a FL classroom: a cross-sectional study of learner requests. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 4(2): 253–286
- Flick, U., von Kardorff, E., and Steinke, I (2004). What is qualitative research? In U. Flick, E. von Kardorff, and I. Steinke (eds.), *A Companion to Qualitative Research* (pp. 3–11). London: SAGE.
- Flor, A. M., Guerra, A. F., & Juan, E. U. (Eds.). (2003). *Pragmatic competence and foreign language teaching* (Vol. 13). Publicacions de la Universitat Jaume I.
- Francis, N. (2000). The shared conceptual system and language processing in bilingual children: findings from literacy assessment in Spanish Náhuatl. *Applied linguistics*, 21(2), 170–204.
- Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(2), 219–236.
- Fries, C. (1945). *Teaching and learning English as a second language*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- Fukushima, S. (1996). Request strategies in British English and Japanese. *Language Sciences*, 18(3-4), 671–688.
- Fukushima, S. (1990). Offers and requests: Performance by Japanese learners of English. *World Englishes*, 9(3), 317–325.
- Fukushima, S., & Iwata, Y. (1987). Politeness strategies in requesting and offering. *JACET Bulletin*, 18, 31–48.
- Garcia, C. (1989). Apologizing in English: Politeness strategies used by native and non-native speakers. *Multilingua-Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 8(1), 3–20.
- Gass, S. M., & Houck, N. (1999). Interlanguage refusals. *Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter*.
- Houck, N., & Gass, S. M. (2009). Non-native refusals: A methodological perspective. In *Speech acts across cultures* (pp. 45-64). De Gruyter Mouton.
- Gass, S. (2000). Changing views of language learning. *British Studies in Applied Linguistics*, 15, 51-67.
- Geoffrey, L. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman.
- Ghazanfari, M., Bonyadi, A., & Malekzadeh, S. (2013). Investigating cross-linguistic differences in refusal speech act among native Persian and English speakers. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 2(4), 49–63.
- Ghazzoul, N. (2019). Linguistic and pragmatic failure of Arab learners in direct polite requests and invitations: A cross-cultural study. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 9(2), 223–230. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0902.13>
- Given, L. M. (Ed.). (2008). *The Sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Golato, A. (2003). Studying compliment responses: A comparison of DCTs and recordings of naturally occurring talk. *Applied linguistics*, 24(1), 90–121.
- Gowasa, N. S., Radiana, S. P., & Afifah, N. (2019). A study on the use of speech acts: A review of selected paper. *ELSYA: Journal of English Language Studies*, 1(2), 55–60.
- GregoriSignes, C., Pennock, B., & Bou, P. (1998). Humour in American Sitcoms. *The Pragmatics of Misunderstanding. Zaragoza: Universidad de Zaragoza*, 73-82.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies* (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.
- Güneş, Ç., & Ortaçtepe, D. (2019). Conceptual socialization in EFL Contexts: A case study on Turkish EFL learners' request speech acts realization. *Journal of*

- Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(1), 376–399.
<https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.547766>.
- Hall, S. (1990). The emergence of cultural studies and the crisis of the humanities. *October*, 53, 11–23.
- Hassall, T. (1999). Request strategies in Indonesian. *Pragmatics. Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA)*, 9(4), 585–606.
- Hinds, J. (1990). Inductive, deductive, quasi-inductive: Expository writing in Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and Thai. *Coherence in writing: Research and pedagogical perspectives*, 87–109.
- Hollway, W., & Jefferson, T. (2008). The free association narrative interview method.
- House, J., & Kasper, G. (1981). Politeness markers in English and German. *Conversational Routine*, 157-185.
- House, J., & Kasper, G. (1987). Interlanguage pragmatics: Requesting in a foreign language. *Perspectives on language in performance*, 2, 1250-1288.
- House, J. (2013). Pragmatics across languages and cultures. In A. Trosborg (Ed.), *The pragmatics of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 363–387). Berlin and New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- House, J. S., Umberson, D., & Landis, K. R. (1988). Structures and processes of social support. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 14(1), 293–318.
- Hu, Z. (2014). Study on developing chinese college EFL learners' pragmatic competence in relation to language proficiency and overseas experience. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(2), 391–398.
<https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.5.2.391-398>.
- Huwari, I. F., & Al-Shboul, Y. (2015). A study on the perception of Jordanian EFL learners' pragmatic transfer of refusals. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 6(1), 46–54.
- Hymes, D. (1971). On communicative competence. In C. J. Brumfit & K. Johnson (Eds.), *The communicative approach to language teaching* (pp. 5-26). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Idris, M. M. & Widyantoro, A. (2019). Intercultural communicative competence (ICC): What should Indonesian EFL teachers have related to ICC's elements?. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 4(1), 67–76.

- Ishihara, N. (2010). Instructional pragmatics: Bridging teaching, research, and teacher education. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 4(10), 938–953.
- Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A. D. (2014). *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet*. London: Routledge.
- İstifçi, İ. (2009). The Use of Apologies by EFL Learners. *English Language Teaching*, 2(3), 15–25.
- İstifçi, İ. (2009). Lexical inferencing strategies of Turkish EFL learners. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 5(1), 97–109.
- James, C. (1980). *Contrastive Analysis*. London: Longman.
- Jalilifar, A. (2009). Request Strategies: Cross-Sectional Study of Iranian EFL Learners and Australian Native Speakers. *English language teaching*, 2(1), 46–61.
- Jazery, M. & Nurhayati, D. A. W. (2019). Cross-cultural communication: communication accommodation experiences of Pattani students with Javanese students at IAIN Tulungagung. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 4(3), 379–393.
- Jia, G. (2008). Heritage language development, maintenance, and attrition among recent Chinese immigrants in New York City. *Chinese as a heritage language: Fostering rooted world citizenry*, 2, 189-203.
- Johnston, M., & Hackmann, A. (1977). Cross-validation and response sets in repeated use of mood questionnaires. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 16(3), 235–239.
- Jung, E. H. (2004). Interlanguage pragmatics: Apology speech acts. In C. L. Moder & A. Martinovic (Eds.), *Discourse across languages and cultures* (pp. 99–116). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kanık, M. (2017). Apology speech act realization by NESTs and NNESTs. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 9(1), 1–12.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language learning*, 16(1-2), 1–20.
- Kaplan, B., & Maxwell, J. A. (2005). Qualitative research methods for evaluating computer information systems. In *Evaluating the organizational impact of healthcare information systems* (pp. 30-55). New York, NY: Springer.
- Kasper, G. (1979). Communication strategies: Modality reduction. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin*, 4(2), 266-283.

- Kasper, G. (1990). Linguistic politeness: Current research issues. *Journal of pragmatics*, 14(2), 193–218.
- Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin (Utrecht)*, 8(3), 203–231.
- Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (Eds.). (1993). *Interlanguage pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
- Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 13(2), 215–247.
- Kasper, G., Rose, K.R., 2002. *Pragmatic Development in a Second Language*. Oxford: Blackwell,
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (Eds.). (2001). *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.
- Kasper, G., & Roever, C. (2005). Pragmatics in second language learning. *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*, 341–358.
- Kasper, G., & Schmidt, R. (1996). Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 18(2), 149–169.
- Kecskes, I., & Papp, T. (2000). *Foreign language and mother tongue*. Psychology Press.
- Kecskes, I., & Papp, T. (2000). Metaphorical competence in trilingual language production. *English in Europe: The Acquisition of a Third Language*, 99–120.
- King, K. A., & Silver, R. E. (1993). "Sticking points": Effects of instruction on NNS refusal strategies. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 9(1), 47–82.
- Klein, W., & Perdue, C. (1997). The Basic Variety (or: Couldn't natural languages be much simpler?). *Second Language Research*, 13(4), 301–347.
- Klein, W. (1996). Language acquisition at different ages. In *Individual development over the lifespan: biological and psychosocial perspectives* (pp. 88-108). Cambridge University Press.
- Koike, D. A. (1989). Pragmatic competence and adult L2 acquisition: Speech acts in interlanguage. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73(3), 279–289.
- Krippendorff, K. (2003). Unitizing. *K. Krippendorff, Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*, 2, 97-110.
- Krulatz, A. (2018). Interlanguage development in speech act strategy choices: Apologies by Norwegian pre-and in-service teachers of English. *Nordic Journal of Modern Language Methodology*, 6(1), 147–169.

- Kwon, J. (2004). Expressing refusals in Korean and in American English. *Multilingua-Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 23(4), 339–364.
- Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers*. University of Michigan Press.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics. Cambridge textbooks in linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, P., Brown, P., Levinson, S. C., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge university press.
- Li, G. A. N. (2004). The Negative Interference of Chinese and Teaching of English Syntax [J]. *Shandong Foreign Languages Teaching Journal*, 4, *Applied linguistics*, 5(3), 255–264.
- Li, R., Suleiman, R. R. R., & Sazalie, A. (2015). An investigation into Chinese EFL learners' pragmatic competence. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 15(2), 101–118. <https://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2015-1502-07>.
- Li, R., & Suleiman, R. R. R. (2017). Language proficiency and the speech act of complaint of Chinese EFL learners. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature*, 23(1), 60–74.
- Lianjian, D. (2006). Fossilization of Second Language Productive Vocabulary [J]. *Foreign Languages and Their Teaching*.
- Lin, Yuh-Huey. (2009). Query preparatory modals: Cross-linguistic and cross-situational variations in request modification. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41(8): 1636–1656.
- Liu, S. (2002). Studies on negative pragmatic transfer in interlanguage pragmatics. *Guangxi Normal University Journal*.
- Liu, J. (2006). An introduction to Chinese philosophy: From ancient philosophy to Chinese Buddhism.
- Lwanga-Lumu, J. C. (2002). Internal request modification by first and second language speakers. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 36(3-4), 289–304.
- Mahmoud, A. (2000). Modern Standard Arabic vs. Non-Standard Arabic: where do Arab students of EFL transfer from?. *Language Culture and Curriculum*, 13(2), 126–136.
- Mahmoud, A. (2005). Collocation errors made by Arab learners of English. *Asian EFL Journal*, 5(2), 117–126.

- Majeed, G. (2010). Ethnicity and ethnic conflict in Pakistan. *Journal of Political Studies*, 17(2), 51–63.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the Self: Implications for Cognition, Emotion, and Motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98(2), 224–253.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Cultural variation in the self-concept. In *The self: Interdisciplinary approaches* (pp. 18-48). Springer, New York, NY.
- Maros, M., & Halim, N. S. (2018). Alerters in Malay and English speech act of request: A contrastive pragmatics analysis. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature*, 24(1), 69–83. <https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2018-2401-06>.
- Márquez Reiter, Rosina. (2000). *Linguistic Politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A Contrastive study of Requests and Apologies*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Martínez-Flor, A. (2008). Analysing request modification devices in films: Implications for pragmatic learning in instructed foreign language contexts. In *Intercultural language use and language learning* (pp. 245-280). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Matalene, C. (1985). Writing teacher in China. *College English*, 47(8), 789–808.
- May, S. (2015). Language policy and political theory. *Research methods in language policy and planning: A practical guide*, 45-55.
- Mayring, P. (2004). Qualitative content analysis. *A Companion to Qualitative Research*, 1(2), 159-176.
- Monsutti, A. (2009). *Local power and transnational resources an anthropological perspective on rural rehabilitation in Afghanistan*. UCLA Asia Institute.
- Monsutti, A. (2009). Transnational Itinerancies: A Look at Afghan Migratory Networks. *Critique Internationale*, (3), 83-104.
- Morgan, B. (2004). Teacher identity as pedagogy: Towards a field-internal conceptualisation in bilingual and second language education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 7(2-3), 172–188.
- Morkus, N. (2009). The realization of the speech act of refusal in Egyptian Arabic by American learners of Arabic as a foreign language. Theses and Dissertations. *Unpublished doctoral dissertation*. College of Education and Department of World Language Education, College of Arts and Sciences, University of South Florida.

- Mu, C., & Carrington, S. B. (2007). An investigation of three Chinese students' English writing strategies. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language-EJ*, 11(1), 1–23.
- Nelson, G. L., Carson, J., Batal, M. A., & Bakary, W. E. (2002). Cross-cultural pragmatics: Strategy use in Egyptian Arabic and American English refusals. *Applied Linguistics*, 23(2), 163–189.
- Nelson, G. L., Al Batal, M., & El Bakary, W. (2002). Directness vs. indirectness: Egyptian Arabic and US English communication style. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 26(1), 39–57.
- Nguyen, T. M. P. (2006). Cross cultural pragmatics: Refusals of requests by Australian native speakers of English and Vietnamese learners of English. *University of Queensland*.
- Niki, Hisae, and Hiroko Tajika. 1994. Asking for permission vs. making requests: Strategies chosen by Japanese speakers of English. In: Lawrence Bouton, and Yamuna Kachru (eds.), *Pragmatics and Language Learning*, Vol. 5. University of Illinois: Urbana, IL, 110–124
- Norris, J., & Ortega, L. (2003). Defining and measuring SLA. *The handbook of second language acquisition*, 716–761.
- Nugroho, A. (2019). Request realizations of Indonesian ESP lecturers. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature & Linguistics*, 6(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.22219/celticumm.vol6.no1.1-13>.
- Nurani, L. M. (2009). Methodological issue in pragmatic research: Is discourse completion test a reliable data collection instrument?. *Jurnal Sositoknologi*, 8(17), 667–678.
- Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Odlin, T. (2006). Could a contrastive analysis ever be complete?. In *Cross-linguistic influences in the second language lexicon* (pp. 22–35). Multilingual Matters.
- Ogiermann, E. (2009a). *On apologising in negative and positive politeness cultures* (Vol. 191). John Benjamins Publishing.

- Ogiermann, E. (2009). Politeness and in-directness across cultures: A comparison of English, German, Polish and Russian requests. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 5(2), 189-216.
- Ogiermann, E. (2010). Teaching politeness with Green Line New? In M. Engelhardt & W. Gehring (eds.), *Fremdsprachendidaktik. Neue Aspekte in Forschung und Lehre*. Oldenburg (117–134). Bis Verlag.
- Ogiermann, Eva. (2018). Discourse completion tasks. In: Andreas Jucker, Klaus Schneider, and Wolfram Bublitz (eds.), *Methods in Pragmatics*. Handbooks of Pragmatics 10. Berlin: de Gruyter, 229–256.
- Ogiermann, E. & Denise S. (2012). Statistics in contrastive pragmatics. In: L. Ruiz de Zarobe & Y. Ruiz de Zarobe (eds.), *Speech Acts and Politeness across Languages and Cultures* (369–398). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Olk, H. (2002). Critical discourse awareness in translation. *The Translator*, 8(1), 101–115.
- Olk, P. (2002). Evaluating strategic alliance performance. *Cooperative strategies and alliances*, 119-143.
- Olshain, E. (1989). Is second language attrition the reversal of second language acquisition?. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11(2), 151–165.
- Olshain, E., & Cohen, A. (1989). Speech act behavior across languages. In H. W. Dechert & M. Raupach (Eds.), *Transfer in language production* (pp. 53–67). Westport, CT: Ablex.
- Ortactape, D. (2012). *The development of conceptual socialization in international students: A language socialization perspective on conceptual fluency and social identity (advances in pragmatics and discourse analysis)*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Pienemann, M. (1998). *Language processing and second language development: Processability theory* (Vol. 15). John Benjamins.
- Pienemann, M. (1998). Developmental dynamics in L1 and L2 acquisition: Processability Theory and generative entrenchment. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1(1), 120.
- Pinyo, S. (2010). *Pra-grmatic Competence in Requests: A Case of Thai English Teachers*. (45), 39. Retrieved from <https://www.nber.org/papers/w15827.pdf>
- Pinto, Derrin. (2005). The acquisition of requests by second language learners of Spanish. *Spanish in Context* 2(1), 1–27.

- Qari, I. (2019). The gender of the addressee as a factor in the selection of apology strategies: The case of Saudi and British. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 7(1), 83–95.
- Quinn, L. D. (1996). The ethnography of manners: Hawthorne, James, Wharton. *Studies in American Fiction*, 24(2), 246–248.
- Rahman, T. (1995). The Pashtu language and identity-formation in Pakistan. *Contemporary South Asia*, 4(2), 151–170.
- Rahman, T. (1995). *Language planning and politics in Pakistan*. Sustainable Development Policy Institute.
- Rahman, T. (1996). The Balochi/Brahvi Language Movements in Pakistan. *Journal of South Asian and Middle Eastern Studies*, 19(3), 71–81.
- Reinecke, J. E. (1969). *Language and dialect in Hawaii*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Renner, M., & Taylor-Powell, E. (2003). Analyzing qualitative data. *Programme Development & Evaluation, University of Wisconsin-Extension Cooperative Extension*.
- Rintell, E. M. (1984). But how did you feel about that?: The learner's perception of emotion in speech¹. *Applied linguistics*, 5(3), 255–264.
- Roever, C. (2006). Validation of a web-based test of ESL pragmalinguistics. *Language Testing*, 23(2), 229–256.
- Roever, C. (2009). 29 Teaching and Testing Pragmatics. *The handbook of language teaching*, 560–577.
- Rose, K. R., & Ono, R. (1995). Eliciting speech act data in Japanese: The effect of questionnaire type. *Language Learning*, 45(2), 191–223.
- Rubin, A. Babbie. (2001). *Research Methods for Social Workers (4th ed.)*. Belmont.
- Ryan, G. W., & Bernard, H. R. (2000). Data management and analysis methods. *Handbook of qualitative research*, 2, 769–802.
- Sadeghi, M. R. (2013). A cross-linguistic investigation of language apology speech act: A case of Persian and Kurdish children. *Journal of Languages and Culture*, 4(3), 30–38.
- SafontJordà, M. P. (2003). Metapragmatic awareness and pragmatic production of third language learners of English: A focus on request acts realizations. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 7(1), 43–68.

- Safont-Jordà, M. P., & Alcón-Soler, E. (2012). Teachability of request act peripheral modification devices in third language learning contexts. *Interlanguage Request Modification*, 217-275.
- Salazar-Campillo, P. (2013). Production of refusals: Insights from stimulated recall. *Utrecht Studies in Language and Communication*, 25, 235–249.
- Saleem, T., Azam, S., & Saleem, A. (2014). The use of apology strategies in English by Pakistani EFL university students in Pakistan. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 5(34), 142–148.
- Sari, R. P., Raja, P., & Sudirman, S. (2015). Politeness and Request Strategies in Act of Request ByEfl Students. *UNILA Journal of English Teaching*, 4(7), 1–10.
- Sasaki, M. (1998). Investigating EFL students' production of speech acts: A comparison of production questionnaires and role plays. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30(4), 457-484.
- Sattar, H. Q., Lah, S. C., & Suleiman, R. R. R. (2009). Iraqi postgraduates' production and perception of requests: A pilot study. *International Journal of Language, Society and Culture*, 29(29), 56–70. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-950X.2012.01065.x>.
- Scarcella, R. C. (1979). Watch Up!: A Study of Verbal Routines in Adult Second Language Performance. *Working Papers on Bilingualism Toronto*, (19), 79–90.
- Scarcella, Robin C., 1983. Developmental trends in the acquisition of conversational competence by adult second language learners. In: Wolfson, N., Judd, E. (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition* (pp. 175–183). Newbury MA: Rowley.
- Oxford, R. L., & Scarcella, R. C. (1994). Second language vocabulary learning among adults: State of the art in vocabulary instruction. *System*, 22(2), 231–243.
- Scollon, R., & Wong-scollon. (1991). Topic confusion in English-Asian discourse. *World Englishes*, 10(2), 113–125.
- Scollon, R. (1991, March). *Eight legs and one elbow: Stance and structure in Chinese English compositions*. Paper presented at the International Reading Association Second North American Conference on Adult and Adolescent Literacy, Banff, Canada.

- Scollon, R. (2000). Generic variability in news stories in Chinese and English: A contrastive discourse study of five days' newspapers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32(6), 761–791.
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2007). Nexus analysis: Refocusing ethnography on action. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11(5), 608–625.
- Searle, J. R., & Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. (1975). Indirect speech acts. *Syntax & Semantics*, 3: *Speech Act*, 59–82.
- Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 1–23.
- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as Qualitative Research: A Guide for Researchers in Education and The Social Sciences*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Selinker, L. (1969). Language transfer. *General linguistics*, 9(2), 67.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 10(1-4), 209–232.
- Selinker, L. (1992). *Rediscovering interlanguage*. London: Longman.
- Selinker, L. (1983). Language transfer. *Language Transfer in Language Learning*, 33–68.
- Selinker, L., & Rutherford, W. E. (2013). *Rediscovering interlanguage*. London: Routledge.
- Selinker, L., Swain, M., & Dumas, G. (1975). The interlanguage hypothesis extended to children 1. *Language Learning*, 25(1), 139–152.
- Shahrokhi, M., & Jan, J. M. (2012). The realization of apology strategies among Persian males. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 692–700.
- Sharwood Smith, M., & Kellerman, E. (1986). Cross linguistic influence in second language acquisition: An introduction. *Cross Linguistic Influence in Second Language Acquisition*, 1–9.
- Shultz, J. J., Florio, S., & Erickson, F. (1982). Aspects of the cultural organization of social relationships in communication at home and in school. *Children in and Out of School: Ethnography and Education*, 88–123.
- Smith, M. S. (1996). Cross linguistic influence with special reference to the acquisition of grammar. *Investigating Second Language Acquisition*, 71–84.

- Soler, E. A., Flor, A. M., & Jordà, M. P. S. (2005). Towards a typology of modifiers for the speech act of requesting: A socio-pragmatic approach. *RAEL: revista electrónica de lingüística aplicada*, (4), 1-35.
- Soler, E. A., & Jordà, P. S. (Eds.). (2007). *Intercultural language use and language learning*. Amsterdam: Springer.
- Sorace, A. (1996). The use of acceptability judgments in second language acquisition research. *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*, 375-409.
- Spradley, J. P. (1979). Ethnography and culture. *The ethnographic interview*. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston: Florida.
- Sridhar, S. N., & Sridhar, K. K. (1980). The syntax and psycholinguistics of bilingual code mixing. *Canadian Journal of Psychology/Revue canadienne de psychologie*, 34(4), 407.
- Sultana, N., & Khan, Q. (2014). Cultural effect of gender on apology strategies of Pakistani undergraduate students. *NUML Journal of Critical Inquiry*, 12(2), 24-42.
- Sumarti, S. & Widodo, P. (2019). An analysis of non-conventionally indirect request in Haikyuu!! (1st season) anime. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 4(1), 87-99.
- Susilo, W. H. (2015). Requests in EFL: Interlanguage pragmatic study on Indonesian learners of English. *Kajian Linguistik dan Sastra*, 27(2), 77-88.
- Suszczyńska, M. (1999). Apologizing in English, Polish and Hungarian: Different languages, different strategies. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31(8), 1053-1065.
- Syahri, I., & Kadarisman, A. E. (2007). Pragmatic transfer in request realizations. *TEFLIN Journal*, 123-147. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v18i2/123-147>.
- Takahashi, K. (1990). Are the key assumptions of the 'Strange Situation' procedure universal? A view from Japanese research. *Human Development*, 33(1), 23-30.
- Takahashi, S. (1996). Pragmatic transferability. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18(2), 189-223.
- Takahashi, S. (2010). The effect of pragmatic instruction on speech act performance. *Speech act performance: Theoretical, empirical and methodological issues*, 127-144.

- 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.
- Takahashi, S., & DuFon, M. A. (1989). Cross-Linguistic Influence in Indirectness: The Case of English Directives Performed by Native Japanese Speakers.
- Tannen, D. (1985). Silence: anything but. *Perspectives on silence*, 93-111.
- Tannen, D. (1985). Relative focus on involvement in oral and written discourse. *Literacy, language, and learning: The nature and consequences of reading and writing*, 124-147.
- Tanaka, N. (1988). Politeness: some problems for Japanese speakers of English. *Association of language teachers*, 9(2), 81.
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2003b). *Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Tawalbeh, A., & Al-Oqaily, E. (2012). In-directness and politeness in American English and Saudi Arabic requests: A cross-cultural comparison. *Asian Social Science*, 8(10), 85-102.
- Taylor, B. P. (1975). The use of overgeneralization and transfer learning strategies by elementary and intermediate students of ESL 1. *Language Learning*, 25(1), 73–107.
- Thi Nguyen, H., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (2009). *Talk-in-interaction: Multilingual perspectives* (Vol. 1). Natl Foreign Lg Resource Ctr.
- Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 91–112.
- Thuruvan, P., & Yunus, M. M. (2017). The speech act of request in the ESL classroom. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature*, 23(4), 212–221. <https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2017-2304-16>.
- Trosborg, A. (1987). Apology strategies in natives/non-natives. *Journal of pragmatics*, 11(2), 147–167.
- Trosborg, A. (2011). *Pragmatics across languages and cultures*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Tatsuki, D. H. (Ed.). (2005). *Pragmatics in Language Learning, Theory, & Practice*. Japan Association for Language Teaching, Pragmatics Special Interest Group.

- Turnbull, W., & Saxton, K. L. (1997). Modal expressions as facework in refusals to comply with requests: I think I should say 'no' right now. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 27(2), 145–181.
- Umale, J. (2011). Pragmatic failure in refusal strategies: British versus Omani interlocutors. *Arab World English Journal*, 2(1), 18–46.
- Upton, T. A., & Lee-Thompson, L. C. (2001). The role of the first language in second language reading. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 23(4), 469–495.
- Weber, R. P. (1990). *Basic content analysis* (Vol. 49). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Wenzhong, H. (1998). Cross-cultural communication and English Learning.
- Whyte, J. (2001, October). Business drivers for the use of virtual reality in the construction sector. In *Proceedings of the Conference AVRII and CONVR 2001*, 99–105.
- Widanta, I. M. R. J., Hudiananingsih, P. D., Sitawati, A. A. R., & Ardika, I. W. D. (2019). Pragmatic errors and transfer of foreign learners of Indonesian: The case of refusals. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 10(3), 501. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1003.13>
- Wolfson, N. (1981). Compliments in cross-cultural perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15(2), 117–124.
- Wolfson, N. (1989). *Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL*. Newbury House.
- Wolfersberger, M. (2003). L1 to L2 writing process and strategy transfer: A look at lower proficiency writers. *TESL-EJ*, 7(2), 1–12.
- Woodfield, Helen. (2008). Interlanguage requests: A contrastive study. In: M. Pütz, & J. N. Aertselaer (eds.), *Developing Contrastive Pragmatics: Interlanguage and Cross-Cultural Perspectives* (pp. 231–264). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Woodfield, Helen, and Maria Economidou-Kogetsidis. (2010). 'I just need more time': A study of native and non-native students' requests to faculty for an extension. *Multilingua*, 29(1): 77–118.
- Wouk, F. (2006). The language of apologizing in Lombok, Indonesia. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(9), 1457–1486.
- Wu, J., & Wang, W. (2016). Apology accepted”: A cross-cultural study of responses to apologies by native speakers of English and Chinese. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 6(2), 63–78. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v6n2p63>

- Yazdanfar, S., & Bonyadi, A. (2016). Request strategies in everyday interactions of Persian and English speakers. *SAGE Open*, 6(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244016679473>.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Yuxin, J., & Cheng, C. (2002). Indirectness in Chinese English writing. *Asian Englishes*, 5(1), 64–74.

APPENDIX A

Written Discourse Completion Tasks (DCTs)

Note: Please read each situation thoroughly in detail. After each situation, please write what you would say in a normal conversation in ENGLISH. There is no right or wrong answer! Please feel free and be honest in your answers. Just be yourself!

Apology

Situation 1. You are a student at University. You have been sick and were not able to attend classes last week. The Chairperson of your department is not only annoyed with this intentional and deliberate practice of skipping the classes, but is also determined to take a strict disciplinary action against you and you might be struck off the rolls as a result of your non-serious attitude. In this situation, you need to seek an apology from the chairperson. You submit an apology before the chairperson by saying:

.....

Situation 2. You are a student who arrives half an hour late to class because you had to go to the doctor for consulting him regarding an important health issue. You entered the class when the professor was in the middle of the lesson. The Professor tells you that your behaviour is not only disruptive but reveals your less interest in academics. The course policy states that late arrivals are not permitted, except for serious documented excuses. You put forward an apology to the Professor by saying:

.....

Situation 3. You decided to take a cup of tea at a local university cafeteria along with your very old intimate friend who has visited you after a long time and with whom you had spent much time together in the past. To show an appropriate manner of hospitality, you fetched a cup of tea and tried to hand over it safely, but anyhow he/she couldn't hold it tightly due to which a few drops of tea split over his/her clothes. Your friend had a startled and frowned look at you. In this situation, you not only feel low on your act as well highly ashamed of it. You submit an apology to your friend by saying:

.....

Requests

Situation 1

You are a newly enrolled student at a University. You have been given an assignment which is meant to be submitted to the concerned teacher within three days, failing which might lead you to failure in the said course and you haven't started working on it yet. You decide to start working on it and the moment you do so, your laptop stops working. A close friend of yours is working as a research student in the department of Computer Science at a University. You need his/her assistance urgently to help you fix the laptop. You put forward a request to that fellow by saying:

.....

Situation 2

You got enrolled in a university after doing your intermediate but somehow you missed a few lectures. You want to get some notes on the previous missing lectures which you have missed earlier anyhow. In this regard, you are seeking the help of your classmate whom you met for the first time. Will you put forward your request in this situation? If yes, please write what you would say in actual conversation.

.....

Situation 3

You are a student. One day you are reading a book in the library. Some of the students in the library sitting very close to you are making noise due to which you are not able to concentrate. You get near to them and ask them to be quiet. Will you put forward a request in this situation? If yes, please write what you would say in actual conversation.

.....

Refusal

Situation 1

You are a professor. Some of your students want to go on a hiking trip for a few days. In this situation, the students need the supervision of a teacher to have a watch on them during these days. The students decide to consult you and request to join them on the trip. But due to your own busy schedule you find it hard to manage it. Will you

refuse the offer of your students? If yes, please write what you would say in actual conversation.

.....

Situation 2

You are a student enrolled in a hairdressing program at an Academy. As part of your practicum, you are working in a reputable salon. As you do not have clients, you are sweeping the salon floor. Your colleague, and close friend, is cutting a woman's hair and asks you whether you could get him/her a cup of coffee. You refuse by saying:

.....

Situation 3

You are a research student in the Department of Computer Science at a University. While in your office, a first-year student enrolled in English Studies Department who is also a close friend of yours, asks whether you can urgently help him/her fix his/her laptop. He/she explains to you that he/she has a paper which is meant to be submitted within three days and he/she urgently needs the laptop to start working on it. As a matter of fact, you do understand the urgency of the matter but you cannot spare time to do it. You refuse this request by saying:

.....

Thank you for filling this questionnaire and sparing your precious time.

APPENDIX B

Oral Open Role-Play

Note: Please give your responses in ENGLISH. There is no right or wrong answer! Please feel free and be honest in your responses. Just be yourself!

Apology

Situation 1

You are a student at University. You have been sick and were not able to attend classes last week. The Chairperson of your department is not only annoyed with this intentional and deliberate practice of skipping the classes, but is also determined to take a strict disciplinary action against you and you might be struck off the rolls of the as a result of your non-serious attitude. In this situation, you need to seek an apology from the chairperson. You submit an apology before the chairperson by saying:

Situation 2

You are a student who arrives half an hour late to class because you had to go to the doctor for consulting him regarding an important health issue. You entered the class when the professor was in the middle of the lesson. The Professor tells you that your behaviour is not only disruptive but reveals your less interest in academics. The course policy states that late arrivals are not permitted, except for serious documented excuses. You put forward an apology to the Professor by saying:

Situation 3

You decided to take a cup of tea at a local university cafeteria along with your very old intimate friend who has visited you after a long time and with whom you had spent much time together in the past. To show an appropriate manner of hospitality, you fetched a cup of tea and tried to hand over it safely, but anyhow he/she couldn't hold it tightly due to which a few drops of tea split over his/her clothes. Your friend had a startled and frowned look at you. In this situation, you not only feel low on your miscreant act as well highly ashamed of it. You submit an apology to your friend by saying:

Requests

Situation 1

You are a newly enrolled student at a University. You have been given an assignment which is meant to be submitted to the concerned teacher within three days, failing which might lead you to failure in the said course and you haven't started working on it yet. You decide to start working on it and the moment you do so, your laptop stops working. A close friend of yours is working as a research student in the department of Computer Science at a University. You need his/her assistance urgently to help you fix the laptop. You put forward a request to that fellow by saying:

Situation 2

You got enrolled in a university after doing your intermediate but somehow you missed a few lectures. You want to get some notes on the previous missing lectures which you have missed earlier anyhow. In this regard, you are seeking the help of your classmate whom you met for the first time. Will you put forward your request in this situation? If yes, please write what you would say in actual conversation.

Situation 3

You are a student. One day you are reading a book in the library. Some of the students in the library sitting very close to you are making noise due to which you are not able to concentrate. You get near to them and ask them to be quiet. Will you put forward a request in this situation? If yes, please write what you would say in actual conversation.

Refusal**Situation 1**

You are a professor. Some of your students want to go on a hiking trip for a few days. In this situation, the students need the supervision of a teacher to have a watch on them during these days. The students decide to consult you and request to join them on the trip. But due to your own busy schedule you find it hard to manage it. Will you refuse the offer of your students? If yes, please write what you would say in actual conversation.

Situation 2

You are a student enrolled in a hairdressing program at an Academy. As part of your practicum, you are working in a reputable salon. As you do not have clients, you are sweeping the salon floor. Your colleague, and close friend, is cutting a woman's hair and asks you whether you could get him/her a cup of coffee. You refuse by saying:

Situation 3

You are a research student in the Department of Computer Science at a University. While in your office, a first-year student enrolled in English Studies Department who is also a close friend of yours, asks whether you can urgently help him/her fix his/her laptop. He/she explains to you that he/she has a paper which is meant to be submitted within three days and he/she urgently needs the laptop to start working on it. As a matter of fact, you do understand the urgency of the matter but you cannot spare time to do it. You refuse this request by saying:

Thank you very much for your assistance and extended co-operation in performing these roles.

APPENDIX C

Semi-structured Interviews

Questions about the speech act of apology

Q.1 In what situations do you prefer to apologize in Pashto/Siraiki? In what situations do you prefer to apologize in English?

Q.2 Do you think apologizing in your native language (Pashto/Siraiki) is different from apologizing in English? If yes, in what ways?

Q.3 In which language do you find apologizing easier, or more convenient, your native language or English? Why?

Q.4 Which apology do you think is more honest, the one made in Pashto/Siraiki or the one made in English? Why?

Q.5 Which apology do you think has a stronger impact on your listener, the one made in your native language or the one made in English? Why do you think so?

Q.6 What significance does Pashtun/ Siraiki culture assign to the speech act of apologizing? Do you think apologizing has the same significance in English culture?

Q.7 When you apologize in English; do you attach the same significance to this speech act which it has in your native culture? Why or why not?

Questions about the speech act of Refusal

Q.1 In what situations do you prefer to make refusals in Pashto/Siraiki? In what situations do you prefer to refuse an offer in English?

Q.2 Do you think refusing someone's offer in your native language (Pashto/Siraiki) is different from a refusal in English? If yes, how are the two different? If no, how are the two similar?

Q.3 In which language do you find refusing easier or more convenient, in your native language or in English? Why?

Q.4 Which refusal do you think is more straightforward, the one made in Pashto/Siraiki or the one made in English? Why?

Q.5 Which refusal do you think would be less embarrassing to your listener, the one made in your native language or the one made in English? Why do you think so?

Questions about the speech act of Requesting

Q.1 In what situations do you prefer to forward requests in Pashto/Siraiki? In what situations do you prefer to make a request in English?

Q.2 Do you think making a request to someone in your native language (Pashto/Siraiki) is different from doing the same in English? If yes, elaborate the differences?

Q.3 In which language do you find requesting easier or more convenient, in your native language or in English? Why?

Q.4 Which request do you think is more direct and straightforward, the one made in Pashto/Siraiki or the one made in English? How?

Q.5 Which request do you think your listener would find more polite/respectful and convincing, the one made in your native language or the one made in English? Why do you think so?

APPENDIX D

Thematic Sheet of Interview Participants for the Speech Act of Apology

Participant	Codes	Categories	Themes
Zarina PSELLL	Belonging, solidarity, communion, acquaintance, stranger, differences, expressive, convenience, mother tongue, transfer, mode, honest, integration, target language, artificial, impact, significance	Lack of proficiency in the target language	Apology is preferred in the mother tongue than the target language. Mother tongue interruption affects the process of learning pragmatic norms in L2.
Malala Gul PSELLL	Intimacy, belonging, solidarity, formal, mode of expression, native language, standardization, sincerity, communicative convenience, hearer oriented, cultural differences, compactness, explanations,	English as a formal code of expression.	English is the need of the day. I want to be at liberty in the choice of medium
Bahadar Khan PSELLL	Social distance, preference, native language, apologizing, natural, expressive, correspondence, translation, affection, wholeheartedness, affinity, assimilation,	Interlocutor status, Difference in realization, Preference to native tongue.	A cry for the consideration of social relative distance Accomplishment of apology through mother tongue
Gulab khan PSELLL	Kinship, informal setting, identity, high status, academic setting, formal expression, thinking, appealing, direct, natural talk, switch, sounds artificial, spontaneous, natural, cultural difference, violation, social norms, variations, practices	Interlocutor holding higher status, No need for translation, Violation of social norms	Lack of vocabulary causes problem to achieve pragmatic competence To me saying 'sorry' and 'I'm sorry' is more convenient
Anmol SSELLL	Informal settings, reverence, choice of medium, details, regret, understanding, expressions, cross culture, variation, obstacles, straightforward, direct, being humble, intensions, trust	Different settings, Mutual understanding, Cultural differences, Provision of explanation	Need for consideration of Setting during interaction I feel at ease with mother tongue
Arooj SSELLL	Formal code, context, transmission, inability, comfort, transfer, linguistic resources, avoid dishonesty, diction choice, constrains, accomplishment, assigned meanings, offence, cultural differences, integration, awareness, exposure	Transfer from mother tongue, English offends the non-native speakers	Mother tongue linguistic resources are integrated into the target language No difference with regard to mode of expression
MaulaBakhsh SSELLL	Situational strategy, less exposure, polite words, literacy, no equivalents, proficiency, softeners, politeness, use and usage, pause fillers, mitigation, belonging, speech community, translation, effectiveness, face assaulting, closeness, solidarity, celebrations	Politeness as a strategy, No balanced proficiency, Pause fillers as softeners	Pragmatic competence is affected while learning L2
Waqar Baloch SSELLL	Nativity, educated class, true expressions, proficiency, inclinations, community, users, difference in codes, freedom	Lack of proficiency, selection of expressions, Freedom for speech	Expressions of apology can't be transmitted into the target language Language is a symbol for freedom

APPENDIX E

Thematic Sheet of Interviews Participants for the Speech Act of Request

Participant	Codes	Categories	Themes
Zarina Khan PSELLL	Intimacy, solidarity, freedom, identity, communion, literacy, indirectness, status, collaboration, intimacy, formal, social distance, face save, global language, communication, multiculturalism, deficient vocabulary, pragmatic competence, facilities, linguistic skills	Mutual intelligibility, Preference to direct requests	Mother tongue is indirect English is direct language
Malala Gul PSELLL	Solidarity, belonging, assimilation, lingua franca, standardization, incompetence, literacy, unsuccessful, communication barriers, linguistic competence, ambition, convenience, deficient vocabulary, media of transmission, comfort, relevance, manner, unnecessary details, evidence, linguistic skills	English as medium of instruction, Convenience with mother tongue	English is lingua franca of the world, Language is a true symbol for freedom and identity
Bahadar Khan PSELLL	Language choice, effectiveness of speech, excitement, linguistic diversity, comfort, solidarity, influence of mother tongue, free expressions, in/formal situations, lack of proficiency, native language, usage, hearer orientation, accomplishment, speech act	Influence of culture and mother tongue	Difference in Linguistics and culture affects the pragmatic transfer
Gulab Khan PSELLL	Belonging, mutual respect, shared background, cultural similarities, cross culture failure, concerns, negotiations, compensations, intended meaning, force, illocutionary act, desires, wishes, celebrations, transmission, deficient vocabulary, cognitive ability, interpretations, direct strategy, values, norms, coordination, mutual understanding, common code	Mother tongue facilitates No bombastic expressions	Language is a means of communication
Anmol Rani SSELLL	Native tongue preference, academic setting, nativization, explanations, communication barrier, translation, interpretations, transfer, cultural values	Mother tongue interference	Mother tongue affects the pragmatic competence
Arooj Jehan SSELLL	Solidarity, linguistic skills, competence, deficient vocabulary, preference to English, winning favour, face saving, situational differences, interruption of mother tongue, convenience, context, extended cooperation, courtesy, politeness, sincerity	Occurrence of pragmatic transfer, contextual factors	English is lingua franca
Maula Bakhsh SSELLL	Mother tongue preference, peculiar words, no equivalents, words selection, transfer, translation, pragmatic competence, time saving, sincerity, wholeheartedness, lexical choices	Integration of linguistic systems, indirectness of English	English is a language of fashion,
Waqar Baloch SSELLL	Educated class, solidarity, linguistic assimilation, diction differences, status of interlocutors, linguistic differences, proficiency, linguistic exposure, judgment, evaluation, effects of medium, community, convincing, politeness, impoliteness, disrespectful	Ease with mother tongue pragmatic transfer	Mother tongue plays a key role.

APPENDIX F

Thematic Sheet of Interview Participants for the Speech Act of Refusal

Participants	Codes	Categories	Themes
Zarina khan PSELLL	Refusals, preference, mother tongue, solidarity, belonging, community, speech, bluntness, arrogance, direct, concerns, annoyance, direct refusals, embarrassment, medium	Preference to direct refusal, Compliance with bluntness, Medium of communication,	English is less embarrassing language to be used for refusal of an offer
Malala Gul PSELLL	Belonging, intimacy, kinship, same community, language choice, setting, context, politeness, face threaten, proficiency, target language, directness, simple negation, utterance, rejection, positive face, politeness	Say just No to an offer	English is a direct language
Bahadar Khan PSELLL	Excitement, effectiveness, impressive, strangers, language power, language status, lack of proficiency, validity, reliability, frankness, homogeneity, realistic	Directness in the target language	Mother tongue sounds more indirect
Gulab khan PSELLL	Informal setting, public talk, distance, status, power, identity, communion, convenience, solidarity, cognition, ability, strategies, attachment, closeness, judgment, intended meanings, cooperation, mutual respect, confidence	Mother tongue use, cognitive ability, utterance meaning,	Language is a world view
Anmol SSELLL	Language choice, speech community, academic setting, formal expressions, valid argument, cogent reasons, explanations, social norms, less proficiency, limitations, vocabulary constrains, avoidance, positive face, other perspective, justifications, less distant	An image of positive face, homogeneity in languages, repair strategies	Sociopragmatic transfer occurs in learning any L2 Pragmatic transfer affects the pragmatic competence
Arooj SSELLL	Mother tongue, preference, informal, identity, shared ethnicity, media, sameness, harmony, objectives, beliefs, ease, convenience, trustworthiness, loyalty, inclinations, rejections, directness, equivalents, words choice, context	Shared knowledge, cultural diversity, lack of confidence, lack of pragmatic awareness	Mother tongue is more direct
Maula Bakhsh SSELLL	Speakers' intension, determination, force, vogue, linguistic choices, explanations, incompetence, easy access, denial, intelligibility, switch, identity, belonging, solidarity, effectives, face saving	Illocutionary force, limited proficiency in the target language, softeners of mother tongue, mutual understanding	I want to be known with my mother tongue
Waqar Baloch SSELLL	Medium, appropriateness, ease, utterance, context, setting, standardization, significance, variations, constrains, solidarity, possessions, tributes, directness, indigenization, understandings, competence	Cultural constrains, linguistic heterogeneity, directness in mothers' tongue,	Mother tongue is less embarrassing one True feelings can only be transmitted through mother tongue

APPENDIX G

Demographic Profile

Part B: Demographic Information (Strictly Confidential)

1. Gender: Female Male
2. Age: 19–21 Years 22–24 Years 25 Years/Above
3. What is your mother Tongue?
4. Language proficiency level.
 - a) Mother Tongue

Speaking	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent
Reading	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent
Writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent
Listening	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent
 - b) English

Speaking	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent
Reading	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent
Writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent
Listening	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent
 - c) Other Language(s). Please write the names of Languages
 - a.

Speaking	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent
Reading	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent
Writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent
Listening	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent
 - b.

Speaking	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent
Reading	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent
Writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent
Listening	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent

APPENDIX H

Consent to Participate in a Research Study

Dear Participant

You are being invited to be a participant in this research study titled “**Pragmatic Transfer of Direct and Indirect Discourse Strategies: A Study of Pashtu and Saraiki Speaking English Language Learners**”. I am Muhammad Farooq Alam, a PhD student in the Faculty of English studies, National University of Modern Languages (NUML), Islamabad, Pakistan. This study is guided by Dr. Aneela Gill, Assistant Professor, Department of English, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad, Pakistan.

Your volunteer participation in this research study will put you among those 50 undergraduate students who will help the researcher to successfully complete his research on the above-cited topic.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the phenomenon of pragmatic transfer among Pashto and Saraiki English language learners, further been delimited to pragmatic transfer in the realisation of speech acts, which are: making an apology, forwarding requests and submitting refusals. Furthermore, this research will identify the strategies that the non-native speakers of English develop (based on ethnic background) in cross cultural settings in order to determine what measures might be taken to address those cross cultural and linguistic influences.

Your participation will involve either a written Discourse Completion Tasks (DCTs), Oral Role Plays and a semi structured interview. Your sole participation in this research study is based on your voluntary consent as a participant.

As a volunteer participant in this study, you are expected to understand the following:

- a) You have the right to decide not to participate at any point during any designated research activity or withdraw from the study at any stage anytime.
- b) The researcher is bound to adhere to your decision and make sure that decision does not lead to any penalty or loss of benefit.
- c) If the researcher wants to publish the findings of his research, he is bound to keep your identity as confidential and any kind of information will not be disclosed to anyone.
- d) DCTs are in written mode, whereas Role Play and semi structured interviews would take place with pseudonyms and the researcher would request the participants not to disclose identity of the coparticipants. The researcher however, cannot guarantee disclosure of the identity of the participants to a second party by any participant.
- e) By signing this document of consent, you are voluntarily granting permission to the researcher, Muhammad Farooq Alam that all the data collected, DCTs, Role Play and Semi Structured Interviews will be transcribed through well-defined coding to ensure the confidentiality of your identity and any other information.

Moreover, the researcher expects that you are not in the circumstances where this research study may affect your health, studies and identity.

The researcher wants to conduct this research study in the Department of English Language and Literature, Gomal University, Dera Ismail Khan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. All the arrangements and facilities you need for participation in this study will be provided by the researcher through the collaboration of the dean or the head of department. Your whole participation will be of 2–3 hours and the schedule will be communicated to you after a thorough analysis of the facilities provided for the study. However, the researcher can alter the schedule according to the needs and availability of the participants.

As this study is based on DCTs, Role Plays and Semi Structured Interviews, there are no potential risks for you as a participant. Moreover, the information you provide voluntarily will be kept confidential and used only for this research study. In addition, you will have a first-hand experience if you conduct research in future.

For any concerns and queries in regard to this research study, please let me know via farooqalam1@hotmail.com or contact me at +92 333 5797062.

By signing this form, you acknowledge that you understand the nature of the study, the potential risks to you (if any) as a participant, and the means by which your identity will be kept confidential. Your signature on this form also indicates that you are 18 years old or older, and that you give your permission to voluntarily serve as a participant in the study and to digitally record your Semi Structured Interview and Oral Role Play.

Thank you for your volunteering, and I appreciate your efforts for sparing time for this research.

Truly Yours,

Muhammad Farooq Alam
PhD Student, Linguistics
National University of Modern Languages
Islamabad, Pakistan

Signature of person agreeing to take part in the study

Date