



Applied Linguistics Faculty Members' Perceptions of
(Im)politeness and (In)appropriateness of L2
Learners' E-Mail Requests

Mahmood Hashemian *

Maryam Farhang-Ju **

Abstract

A significant amount of contribution to pragmatics research comes from cross-cultural and developmental pragmatic studies with L2 learners in focus; however, despite broad interest in such analyses, the role of lecturers has been relatively ignored. As the lecturers' perceptions/opinions of L2 learners' e-mail requests are important, L2 learners must become familiar with their lecturers' perceptions of (in)appropriateness and (im)politeness of e-mail requests. Therefore, through examining Iranian applied linguistics lecturers' perceptions of (in)appropriateness and (im)politeness of L2 learners' e-mail requests, this study was an attempt to provide insights into lecturers' ideal norms of (in)appropriateness and (im)politeness of L2 learners' e-mail requests. To this aim, a purposive sample of 38 university lecturers participated in this study. A questionnaire was utilized to collect the data. The lecturers' comments in the questionnaire served as the basis to identify the major themes (e.g., directness, language use accuracy, etc.). An in-depth qualitative analysis of the lecturers' comments revealed that the perceptions of the lecturers were greatly influenced by the use of appropriate openings and closings of the e-mails. Also, language use accuracy and appropriateness were among the most recurring reasons mentioned by the lecturers to regard the e-mails as (in)appropriate and (im)polite. Overall, the results stress the importance of pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects of language for applied linguistics lecturers. Findings have implications for L2 learners, teachers, and researchers.

Keywords: E-mail, (Im)politeness, (In)appropriateness, Politeness, Request

Received: 10/09/2019

Accepted: 01/12/2019

* Associate Professor, Shahrekord University- Email: hashemian-m@sku.ac.ir, Corresponding author

** M.A, Shahrekord University -Email: farhang.mariam@gmail.com

Pragmatic competence, as part of communicative competence, enables L2 learners to use the L2 in interpersonal relationships. Pragmatic competence is defined as L2 learners' ability to put into practice their knowledge to express intentions/feelings and to interpret those of their interlocutors (Fraser, 2010). Pragmatic competence consists of contextualized knowledge and interpretation of socially appropriate illocutionary acts in discourse. So, L2 learners should have a pragmatic ability to comprehend pragmalinguistic actions and to produce L2 utterances following the L2 cultural norms. If L2 learners fail to interpret the speaker's intention and/or to produce appropriate expressions, *pragmatic failure* occurs (Chen, 2011).

Politeness is one of the main components of pragmatics research proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987), who refer to politeness as consideration of another person's *face*. As defined by Leech (1983), politeness is a principle "to maintain the social equilibrium and the friendly relations which enable us to assume that our interlocutors are cooperative in the first place" (p. 82). Fraser (1975) refers to politeness as "a property associated with an utterance in which, according to the hearer, the speaker has neither exceeded any rights nor failed to fulfill any obligations" (as cited in Najeeb, Maros, & Nor, 2012, p. 43). Locher (2004) criticized such traditional views of politeness. Based on her views, using certain linguistic forms does not lead to politeness. In her model of politeness, the role of the addressee is emphasized more significantly than that of the addresser. This simply means that politeness may be interpreted differently by individuals. Hence, in investigating politeness, it seems prominent to consider an individual's interpretations and expectations of politeness into account (Zou & Leung, 2015).

Discourse communities are those that share detailed knowledge and appreciation of the trends in that community (Swale, 1990, as cited in Abdi, Tavangar Rizi, & Tavakoli, 2010). The academic community is of the typical discourse communities. When examining the norms of politeness, one key issue is the perceptions of the discourse community members. As each discourse community has different norms, their

politeness norms may also vary. Accordingly, it is prominent to examine the politeness norms of the academic community. Traditionally, L2 researchers (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Jalilifar, 2009; Reinbold, 2004) have studied various languages or cultures to investigate their norms in politeness research. However, according to Kadar and Haugh (2013), norms can vary in different types of social units such as practice communities (Mills, 2003) and various social groups (Haugh & Schneider, 2012).

Furthermore, norms are situation- or context-dependent (Culpeper, Haugh, & Kadar, 2017). As different social groups and situations have different politeness norms; these differences should be examined. Such features make communicating with people in different settings, especially in formal contexts like academic contexts, a challenging task. The emerging consensus among researchers (e.g., Biesenbach-Lucas, 2005, 2007; Savic, 2018) appears to be that L2 learners use a variety of polite strategies to convey social context information like status. In turn, using different cues in e-mails, recipient e-mail users (in this study, the lecturers) form their judgments of the senders (Byron & Baldrige, 2007). However, people may interpret such cues differently.

As lectures' perceptions/opinions of L2 learners' e-mail requests are essential, L2 learners must become familiar with their lecturers' perceptions/opinions of (in)appropriateness and (im)politeness of e-mail requests, so that they will be able to mitigate their requests politely. Therefore, the current study was conducted in an attempt to offer useful insights into Iranian applied linguistics lecturers' perceptions/opinions of (in)appropriateness and (im)politeness of e-mail requests of their L2 learners.

Review of Literature

Iranian L2 Learners' E-Mail Requests

Brown and Levinson (1987) regard speech acts such as requests to be face-threatening. As an inherently face-threatening speech act, requests are utterances by which the speaker wants or requests the addressee to perform

an action for him or her (Rue & Zhang, 2008). With the advancement of technology, L2 learners use e-mail to mitigate their requests (Biesenbach-Lucas, 2005). It has been noted that e-mail is most preferred by L2 learners who feel uncomfortable participating in the classroom and, thus, e-mail can facilitate learning through virtual consultation (Félix-Brasdefer, 2012). E-mail is used widely as an effective medium all over the world for exchanges between distant groups of people for formal and informal communication (Crystal, 2001). E-mail has become the most common form of computer-mediated communication in academic contexts for both personal communication and pedagogical purposes (Biesenbach-Lucas, 2005).

The widespread use of e-mail has led L2 scholars (Biesenbach-Lucas, 2005, 2007; Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2011; Eslami, 2013; Hashemian & Farhang-Ju, 2017) to investigate the issue from a pragmatic perspective. For example, Eslami (2013) compared Iranian and American graduate students' opening strategies of 300 requestive e-mails sent to a faculty member. Her findings indicated that the Iranian and American students used openings in their e-mails; however, the Iranian students used a higher number of words in the openings of their e-mails (13.3 words and 3.6 moves), compared to the American students (5.4 words and 1.5 moves). Furthermore, small talk occurred more frequently in the Iranian students' e-mails, indicating their inclination to build an interpersonal relationship with the lecturer before mitigating their requests. Mohammadi (2016) examined 100 requestive e-mails to faculty produced by Iranian and American students. She categorized the e-mails' salutations into 12 salutation strategies categories. The chi-square results showed that the salutation strategies used by the Iranian students were significantly different from those of American students'.

Zarei and Mohammadi (2012) examined the requests produced by Iranian L2 learners. They reported that the L2 learners' e-mails were typically characterized by frequent use of directness and absence of greetings and closings. Furthermore, lexical downgraders were marginal, and different address terms were utilized. Moreover, Parviz (2012)

examined Iranian L2 learners' e-mails. The findings indicated that the pragmatic problems that the learners had were related to pragmalinguistic competence (e.g., modal use, hedging expressions, and information sequencing) and sociopragmatic competence (e.g., status maintenance, politeness realization, and identity construction). Their findings provided further support in that high levels of grammatical competence of advanced L2 learners did not guarantee that they were pragmatically competent (Eslami, Eslami-Rasekh, & Fatahi, 2004). Izadi and Zilaie (2012) tried to find out common positive strategies in e-mail exchanges between close friends. For this purpose, they examined 60 e-mail exchanges between close friends. Their results illustrated that group identity markers and giving gifts to the addressee were the most common strategies used by the participants.

Finally, Hayati, Shokouhi, and Hadadi (2011) examined e-mail requests of L2 learners and physics postgraduate students. They examined 100 e-mails to identify the strategies, moves, and most typical lexicogrammatical features. Their findings illustrated that L2 learners and physics postgraduate students had utilized similar writing moves; however, different strategies and microstructures had been employed.

Lecturers' Perception of Politeness

Given the significance of effective e-mail communication in academic settings (Félix-Brasdefer, 2012), few studies have probed lecturers' perceptions of idealized e-mail requests (e.g., Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2011; Savic, 2018). For example, Economidou-Kogetsidis (2011) used a questionnaire to examine the British lecturers' evaluation of nonnative students' e-mails in terms of politeness. The lecturers were teaching various subjects in higher education (other than linguistics). The lecturers' perceptions of the e-mails differed from one person to another; however, some themes were recognized. For instance, most of the lecturers' perceived direct strategies and the absence of mitigation and salutation as negative points in their e-mails, whereas the lecturers perceived the use of *'thank you'* and preclosing positively. Economidou-

Koetsidis (2016) conducted another study to see if the nonnative students' and British lecturers' perceptions and evaluations of direct e-mails were significantly different. The lecturers were native speakers of English who were teaching various subjects other than linguistics. The results indicated that the lecturers and students interpreted politeness differently. The findings further illustrated that the lecturers negatively perceived the students' personalities who had used direct e-mails.

Moreover, Savic (2018) conducted a study to see the extent to which Norwegian university lecturers perceived L2 learners' e-mail requests as (im)polite and (in)appropriate. Her findings indicated that some lecturers believed that formal address terms and appropriate pragmalinguistic choices had to be used in e-mails sent to faculty. Furthermore, Bolkan and Holmgren (2012) found that the employed politeness strategies influenced the learners' competence and the lecturers' motivation to work with them in their e-mails. In a similar vein, the results of the study by Stephens, Houser, and Cowan (2009) revealed that the quality of the e-mails had a significant impact on the way the lecturers perceived the students' credibility.

Finally, Zarei and Mohammad (2012) investigated Iranian lecturers' perceptions of e-mail requests of Iranian postgraduate students to their professors. Using a discourse completion test, they collected 60 English e-mails composed by the L2 learner participants. The results indicated that those e-mail requests adorned with greetings and closings were valued positively by the lecturers. The lecturers mentioned that the lack of greetings and closings made the L2 learners' e-mails perceived as abrupt. The underuse of internal modification negatively affected the faculty members' perceptions of the learners' personalities. Indeed, the qualitative data received from the perception questionnaire indicated that the lack of mitigation affected the faculty participants in their perceptions. The lack of salutations and spelling mistakes significantly affected the faculty members' perceptions of their L2 learners' e-mail requests.

As the above review suggests, the focus of previous pragmatic studies has been on the ability to use speech acts appropriately. These studies (e.g.,

Economidou-Koetsidis, 2011; Félix-Brasdefer, 2012; Reinbold, 2004) provide empirical evidence on interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) and L2 learners' pragmatic performance. Such studies have been beneficial in highlighting those areas where L2 learners may deviate from their lecturers' norms and expectations. However, the focus of such studies has been on L2 learners rather than on lecturers, and few systemic attempts have been made to identify lecturers' perceptions of (in)appropriate and (im)polite e-mail requests. Therefore, to bridge the gap in the literature, the current study was an attempt to answer the following research questions:

1. To what extent do applied linguistics faculty members perceive L2 learners' e-mails (in)appropriate or (im)polite?
2. Why do applied linguistics faculty members perceive L2 learners' e-mails (in)appropriate or (im)polite?

Method

This study was conducted in three phases, working with Iranian L2 learners and applied linguistics faculty members. After analyzing the L2 learners' e-mail requests, those requests which were suitable to be included in the questionnaire (see Appendix) were selected. Then, the questionnaire was designed and developed. The following sections provide a detailed elaboration of each stage.

Phase 1: Participants, Instruments, and Procedures

The e-mail data consisted of 173 authentic e-mail requests written by 32 L2 learners to one of the researchers of the current study in English for over 12 months. The confidential e-mails were removed from the study. The e-mails were written by the L2 learners who were taking M.A. courses in TEFL or writing their M.A. proposals/theses. Following ethical issues, the senders of those e-mails to the professor completed an online consent form. They were assured that their e-mails would be utilized for research purposes, and their personal information would be kept confidential. Importantly, the data were collected after they had passed the course. This

would provide the learners with an opportunity to make sure participation in this study would not have any (probable) effects on their grades.

Then, the L2 learner participants were asked to fill an online demographic form that elicited information about their age, national background, and L1. They were all Iranian M.A. students in a state university in Iran, whose ages ranged from 23 to 35 ($M = 27.87$; $SD = 4.26$). The participants were exposed to the teaching of English as an L2 for an average of 14 years. They were primarily exposed to traditional teaching methods that emphasized grammar, rather than communication and pragmatic competence via interaction (see Table 1):

Table 1.

Participants' Demographic Information in Phase 1

Variables	Number	Age
Age	32	23-35
<i>M</i>		27.87
<i>SD</i>		4.26

The e-mail requests were written to a male full-time teaching faculty member at the same university (i.e., one of the researchers). The recipient of the e-mails was in his forties at the time of data collection and was teaching B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. courses in English methodology, discourse analysis, and academic writing, as well as supervising M.A. theses and Ph.D. dissertations. The L2 learner participants used the last name of the professor and had contact with him during class and office hours. On average, he would receive 10 e-mails daily from his L2 learners.

Following Félix-Brasdefer (2012), the e-mail requests were classified into four request categories (i.e., request for information, request for validation, request for feedback, and request for action) to choose from among to develop the questionnaire. Out of the 173 e-mail requests, 50 (28.8%) were classified as requests for information, 10 (5.7%) as requests for validation, 25 (14.46%) as requests for feedback, and 88 (50.86%) as requests for action. When selecting the e-mails, two factors were taken into

account: (1) to include the same ratio in the questionnaire, and (2) to include e-mails with different parts (i.e., subject, opening, head acts, their internal modification, supportive moves, and closing) that were analyzed and coded (Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper 1989).

The frequency of each pragmalinguistic form of each subcategory (i.e., openings, closings, etc.) was counted. The following 19 openings, for instance, were identified: *Hi; Hello; Hi dear professor; hello dear professor; Greeting Dr. X; Hello my dear Ostad; Hi doctor; Dear Dr. X Hello; Dear Dr. X hi; Hi, dear Dr; dear professor; dear Dr. X; Dear professor X; hello again; dear sir; dear instructor; good morning; good evening; and no greeting*. The diversity identified in the greetings provides support for the findings of previous research (e.g., Mohammadi, 2016).

Then, based on the following criteria, 20 e-mails were included in the questionnaire for the next phase of the study: (1) considering the ratio of the different categories requests (e.g., information, validation, feedback, and action), (2) to include different pragmalinguistic forms within each category as much as possible, (3) pragmalinguistic forms with greater frequency, (4) both formal and informal language, and (5) e-mails that contain errors (e.g., grammar, punctuation, etc.). The e-mails varied in terms of imposition, but power and distance were kept constant (see Table 2):

Table 2.

Summary of Politeness and Modification Features of Questionnaire E-Mails

E-Mails	Structure
E-mail # 1	Dear + Dr. + LN, Greeting, Could you + Politeness Marker Please + Thanks, Closing
E-mail # 2	Greeting (Hi) + Dear + Professor, Is it possible, Thanks, [no closing]
E-mail # 3	Dear+ Dr. + LN + Greeting (Hi), Politeness Marker Please + Imperative, Grounder, Thanks, Closing
E-mail # 4	Greeting + Dr. + LN, Grounder, Can I, Thanks, [no closing]
E-mail # 5	Dear + sir, I would like, Thanks, Closing
E-mail # 6	Greeting (Hello) + My+ Dear + Ostad, Could You, Thanks, Closing

E-Mails	Structure
E-mail # 7	Greeting (Hello) + Dear + Sir + Greeting, grounder, Could you + Politeness Marker Please, Closing
E-mail # 8	Dear+ Dr. + LN + Greeting (Hi), Grounder, Direct Question, Thanks, Closing
E-mail # 9	Greeting (Hi, goodnight) + Dr., grounder, If you, Thanks, [no closing]
E-mail # 10	Dear + Professor, Greeting (I hope you are doing fine), Sorry, Grounder, Shall I, Imposition Minimizer, Closing
E-mail # 11	Dear + Professor + LN, Greeting (I hope you are doing fine), Sorry, Grounder, I am wondering, Thanks, Closing
E-mail # 12	Dear + Dr. + LN, Greeting, I was wondering if, Thanks, Closing
E-mail # 13	Dear + Professor, Greeting (Hi), Grounder + Would You + Politeness Marker Please, Thanks, [no closing]
E-mail # 14	Greeting (Hi) + Dr. + LN, Could you + Politeness Marker Please, Grounder, Thanks, [no closing]
E-mail # 15	Dear + Instructor, Thanks, May I, Grounder, Thanks, [no closing]
E-mail # 16	[No Address form], Greeting (hello), Politeness Marker Please + Imperative, Thanks, [no closing]
E-mail # 17	Greeting (Hi) + Dear + Dr. + LN, May I, Thanks, [no closing]
E-mail # 18	[No Address form], Greeting (Hello), Direct Question, Thanks, [no closing]
E-mail # 19	Dear +Dr. LN, Grounder, Politeness Marker Please + Imperative, Thanks, [no closing]
E-mail # 20	Dear + Professor + LN, Greeting (I hope you are doing fine), I wonder if, Grounder, Thanks, Closing

Phase 2: Participants, Instruments, and Procedures

We conducted a pilot study to make the necessary modifications in the questionnaire. Another purpose of this stage of the study was to identify the most (im)polite e-mails. The first section was devoted to eliciting background information, such as age, gender, and L1. The second section comprised of 20 e-mails. A 5-point Likert-type scale was placed for each e-mail to collect the faculty participants' ratings regarding politeness for each e-mail. The rating scale ranged from 1 (*very impolite*) to 5 (*very polite*).

The questionnaire was designed and distributed online. An invitation was sent to over 100 Iranian lecturers via social media applications such

as e-mail and LinkedIn in April 2019. University lecturers majoring in applied linguistics, selected through purposive sampling, participated in the current study. They were chosen because pragmatics is one of the keys and significant courses that applied linguistics Ph.D. candidates need to pass. Hence, they were fully acquainted with pragmatics and could recognize polite and appropriate e-mails. A convenient sample of 34 Iranian university lecturers of English volunteered to fill out the questionnaire. Their ages ranged from 30 to 53 ($M = 41.3$). There were 12 male (35%) and 22 female faculty participants (65%) with Persian as their L1. They had 1-11+ years of teaching experience in higher education. Based on the results of this phase, the questionnaire was revised for the next step of the study (see Table 3):

Table 3.

Participants' Demographic Information in Phase 2

Variables	Number	Age
Female	22	30-53
Male	12	
<i>M</i>		41.3

After the participant lecturers had filled the questionnaire, the frequencies and percentages were computed. Three e-mails considered the politest (E-mails # 10, 11, and 20) and six regarded the most impolite (E-mails # 6, 9, 13, 15, 16, and 18) were chosen to be included in the final version of the questionnaire (see Table 4):

Table 4.

Rating of E-Mails Selected Regarding Politeness

E-Mails	Polite	Neutral	Impolite
E-mail # 1	4 (11.8%)	18 (52.9%)	14 (41.2%)
E-mail # 2	2 (5.9%)	12 (35.3%)	20 (58.8%)
E-mail # 3	10 (29.4%)	6 (17.6%)	18 (52.9%)
E-mail # 4	4 (11.8%)	10 (29.4%)	20 (58.8%)
E-mail # 5	12 (35.3%)	10 (29.4%)	12 (35.3%)

E-mail # 6	2 (5.9%)	4 (11.8%)	28 (82.3%)
E-mail # 7	4 (11.8%)	8 (23.5%)	22 (64.7%)
E-mail # 8	6 (17.6%)	18 (52.9%)	10 (29.4%)
E-mail# 9	0 (0%)	8 (23.5%)	26 (76.5%)
E-mail # 10	28 (82.3%)	6 (17.6%)	0 (0%)
E-mail # 11	26 (76.5%)	6 (17.6%)	2 (5.9%)
E-mail # 12	6 (17.6%)	18 (52.9%)	10 (29.4%)
E-mail # 13	2 (5.9%)	6 (17.6%)	26 (76.5%)
E-mail # 14	4 (11.8%)	18 (52.9%)	12 (35.3%)
E-mail # 15	0 (0%)	2 (5.9%)	32 (94.1%)
E-mail # 16	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	34 (100%)
E-mail # 17	4 (11.8%)	4 (41.2%)	16 (47%)
E-mail # 18	0 (0%)	2 (5.9%)	32 (94.1%)
E-mail # 19	8 (23.5%)	10 (29.4%)	16 (47.1%)
E-mail # 20	30 (88.2%)	4 (11.8%)	0 (0%)

Two experts in pragmatic assessment reviewed and revised the final version of the questionnaire to make sure it was suitable to be used in the study. A British native speaker who had an M.A. in linguistics revised the final version of the questionnaire to improve the language style of the Guidelines section of the questionnaire.

Phase 3: Participants, Instruments, and Procedure

A convenience sample of 38 university lecturers of English in different universities in Iran, who had not participated in the previous phase of the study, completed the final version of the questionnaire. Their ages ranged from 32-58 ($M = 45.4$). There were 22 male and 16 female faculty participants (see Table 5):

Table 5.

Participants' Demographic Information in Phase 3

Variable	Number	Age
Female	16	32-85
Male	22	
<i>M</i>		45.4

The university lecturers' L1 was Persian and had 1-11+ years of teaching experience in higher education. The questionnaire consisted of a demography section and nine e-mails. The primary purpose of the questionnaire was to elicit the faculty participants' perceptions/opinions of (im)politeness and (in)appropriateness of the e-mails, as elicited by two 5-point Likert scale questions, ranging from 1 (*very impolite*) to 5 (*very polite*) and from 1 (*completely inappropriate*) to 5 (*entirely appropriate*).

Immediately after each situation, there were two Comment sections regarding the framing moves and contents of the e-mails, so that the faculty participants would write down their criteria for rating the e-mails as (im)polite and (in)appropriate. The framing moves included the subject, address term, greetings, self-introduction, and closing sequences. Those sections in which the learners had mitigated their requests and had explained their purpose of sending the e-mails (i.e., request head acts as well as internal and external modifications) were considered the content moves.

The Comment sections of the questionnaire provided an aid through which the lecturers verbalized their thoughts while evaluating the e-mail requests as being (im)polite and (in)appropriate. Two experts in pragmatics checked the questionnaire to make sure it was valid and suitable to be used in the current study.

Then, descriptive statistics were used to summarize the data in the questionnaire (see Tables 6 and 7). Finally, the content analysis method was employed to analyze the lecturers' comments in the questionnaire. The faculty participants' comments served as the basis to identify the major themes (e.g., directness, linguistic accuracy, etc.). The following criteria were used for the Comment section of the questionnaire (see Tajeddin & Alemi, 2012):

- **Thanking:** It refers to mitigation devices to soothe the face-threatening impact and to console the hearer.
- **Organization and format:** To make comprehensible e-requests, the addressers must follow a particular format. For example, they should use an address term and end their requests with a signature.

- **Explanation:** A concise elaboration on the purpose of the request is required when mitigating requests. This is particularly crucial because it avoids confusion and helps the audience to understand the situation. This feature eventually may lead to approval of the interlocutor's request.
- **Interlocutors' characteristics and relationships:** When rating the learners' e-mail requests, the lecturers consider the power, social status, and level of formality essential factors that the learners should take into consideration when mitigating requests via e-mail.
- **Politeness.** The other criterion is politeness, the interpretation of which varies in different cultures.
- **Directness:** This criterion refers to the lecturers' opinions of expressions to see if they are at the proper level of directness.
- **Appropriateness:** This criterion refers to the lecturers' opinions of the language used in different social and cultural contexts.
- **Alternative options:** This criterion is used to evaluate the learners' success/failure in giving other choices after a request to ease the situation for the addressee.
- **Language usage accuracy:** This criterion is related to language accuracy (i.e., structures, grammar, and lexicon).
- **Authenticity:** This criterion pertains to issues such as the naturalness of utterances— what native speakers naturally say in the proposed situations and the normalness issue.

Results

To find an answer for the first research question, the frequency and percentage of the faculty participants' perceptions of (in)appropriateness and (im)politeness of the e-mail requests were calculated. Table 6 reports the frequency of the lecturers' perceptions of the (in)appropriateness of the e-mail requests. As shown, the most appropriate e-mail requests selected by the faculty participants were E-mails # 3, 4, and 9 (100%), whereas the

most inappropriate e-mail requests were E-mails # 1, 6, 7, and 8 (73.7%, 78.9%, 68.4%, and 68.4%, respectively):

Table 6.

Frequency of Lecturers' Ratings of E-Mail Requests Regarding (In)appropriateness

E-Mails	Appropriate	Neutral	Inappropriate
E-mail # 1	8 (21%)	2 (5.3%)	28 (73.7%)
E-mail # 2	10 (26.3%)	10 (26.3%)	18 (47.4%)
E-mail # 3	38 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
E-mail # 4	38 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
E-mail # 5	8 (21.1%)	10 (26.3%)	20 (52.6%)
E-mail # 6	2 (5.3%)	6 (15.8%)	30 (78.9%)
E-mail # 7	4 (10.5%)	8 (21.1%)	26 (68.4%)
E-mail # 8	4 (10.5%)	8 (21%)	26 (68.4%)
E-mail # 9	38 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table 7 indicates the results of the faculty participants' perceptions of (im)politeness of the e-mail requests. The findings indicate that the politest e-mail requests were E-mails # 3, 4, and 9 (100%), whereas the most impolite e-mail requests were E-mails # 6, 7, and 8 (63.2%, 63.2%, and 73.6%, respectively):

Table 7.

Frequency of Lecturers' Ratings of E-Mail Requests Regarding (Im)politeness

E-Mails	Polite	Neutral	Impolite
E-mail # 1	20 (52.7%)	14 (36.8%)	4 (10.5%)
E-mail # 2	8 (21.1%)	12 (31.6%)	18 (47.3%)
E-mail # 3	38 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
E-mail # 4	38 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
E-mail # 5	12 (31.6%)	12 (31.6%)	14 (36.8%)
E-mail # 6	4 (10.5%)	10 (26.3%)	22 (63.2%)
E-mail # 7	4 (10.5%)	10 (26.3%)	22 (63.2%)
E-mail # 8	2 (5.3%)	8 (21.1%)	28 (73.6%)
E-mail # 9	38 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

As for the Comment sections, the faculty participants' reasons for choosing the ratings were codified. Table 8 indicates the frequency of the occurrence of each criterion in the data for the content moves:

Table 8.
Lecturers' Perceptions of Content Moves

	E-Mail # 1	E-Mail # 2	E-Mail # 3	E-Mail # 4	E-Mail # 5	E-Mail # 6	E-Mail # 7	E-Mail # 8	E-Mail # 9	Total
Organization and format	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (7.14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (.54%)
Explanation	10 (21.73%)	6 (16.6%)	8 (28.57%)	6 (16.6%)	6 (18.75%)	2 (3.7%)	10 (23.8%)	8 (22.2%)	2 (4.76%)	58 (15.76%)
Interlocutors' characteristics and relationships	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (18.75%)	0 (0%)	4 (9.52%)	2 (5.55%)	2 (4.76%)	14 (4.61%)
Politeness	2 (4.35%)	0 (0%)	4 (14.28%)	4 (11.1%)	4 (8.33%)	4 (7.41%)	4 (9.52%)	6 (16.6%)	4 (9.5%)	32 (8.69%)
Directness	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (4.16%)	10 (18.5%)	8 (19.0%)	4 (11.1%)	0 (0%)	24 (6.52%)
Alternative options	2 (4.35%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (5.55%)	0 (0%)	2 (3.7%)	4 (9.52%)	0 (0%)	2 (4.76%)	12 (3.26%)
Appropriateness	2 (4.35%)	10 (27.7%)	4 (14.28%)	10 (27.7%)	14 (29.1%)	14 (25.9%)	6 (14.2%)	10 (27.7%)	16 (38.1%)	85 (23.1%)
Language usage accuracy	30 (65.2%)	20 (55.5%)	8 (28.57%)	10 (27.7%)	14 (29.1%)	18 (33.3%)	6 (14.2%)	6 (16.6%)	16 (38.1%)	128 (34.7%)
Authenticity	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (7.14%)	4 (11.1%)	2 (4.16%)	4 (7.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	12 (3.26%)
Total	46 (100%)	36 (100%)	28 (100%)	36 (100%)	48 (100%)	54 (100%)	42 (100%)	36 (100%)	42 (100%)	368 (100%)

The first and foremost criterion mentioned by the lecturers in the Comment sections was language usage accuracy (i.e., grammatical points, syntactic elements, word choice, spelling, and punctuation). Lexis and the type of wording the L2 learners had used played a significant role in determining the appropriateness of their e-mail requests. Therefore, accuracy, scope, and breadth of lexis and the kind of wording the L2 learners had used while mitigating their e-mail requests were regarded as a prevailing point by the lecturers. The lecturers dedicated the largest portion of their attention to this parameter, as they thought that for a request to be expressed, it seems crucial that L2 learners should observe language use accuracy. Examples are provided sequentially for this criterion:

- Extract # 1
 - *It includes the required vocabulary and syntax.*
 - *Language is good. Punctuation and capitalization are applied.*

The next frequent criterion was appropriateness. The faculty participants considered the e-mail requests produced by the L2 learners as either appropriate or inappropriate. Differently put, it is indispensable to mitigate requests properly with an interlocutor, as a large number of factors may leave one's request vulnerable to inappropriacy:

- Extract # 2
 - *What do you think about that is not an appropriate way of asking for comment.*

The third dominant criterion was predominantly concerned with the fact that the lecturers considered the e-mail requests as not comprehensive enough in terms of content. Moreover, sufficient information to prove or justify the requests was crucial for them, as it leads requests to be more understandable and more accessible to be accepted comparing to those which are quite short. Some examples of this criterion by the lecturers are presented below:

- Extract # 3
 - *The body of the e-mail does not provide enough information about the attached file.*

- *The body is excellent, and the student has to elaborate on her request before getting to the point.*
- *The body of the paragraph needs to provide more information on why the request is made to alleviate the force of request as a face-threatening act.*

The fourth frequently occurring criterion was politeness, which was one of the predominant and widely acknowledged factors by the faculty participants in the Comment sections. In this regard, L2 learners may easily be attached to the label *rude* as soon as the face of the interlocutor is threatened. Therefore, to sound polite, L2 learners should use an appropriate kind of language that suits the kind of interlocutor(s) he or she is talking to and the setting. The following is an example of the faculty participants' comments:

- Extract # 4
 - *The writer has made his request very polite.*
 - *It is too impolite. I need to call u? I would add some other sentences to decrease the tension.*
 - *Perfect. Very polite.*

The following criterion was directness. This criterion explains whether requests are at the proper level of directness:

- Extract # 5
 - *It is too direct. It is rude, as it is like an order.*
 - *It is like he is giving an order. It is too direct.*
 - *The tone of the e-mail is very direct as if a boss ordering his staff to do something for him!*

The next frequent criterion that affected the lecturers' perception was the interlocutors' characteristics and relationships such as formality, power, and social distance. Examples of this criterion are provided below:

- Extract # 6
 - *Using imperatives are not suitable for a student-professor relationship, I personally think due to power and distance between professor and student, they not should use it.*

- *Since the social-distance relation is low to high, appropriate politeness devices should have been included in.*
- *It seems a little bit informal! Considering the relationship between a professor and a student, a more formal e-mail should be written.*

The next criterion taken into account by the lecturers was the authenticity of the L2 learners' requests, which dealt with the influence of their L1 in some of their mitigated requests:

- Extract # 7
 - *The use of sorry for disruption sounds unnatural.*
 - *I can see sources of politeness markers from L1 (i.e., Persian). Requests in English are made differently.*
 - *I'm sorry for troubling you sounds a bit odd. There are a few instances of unnatural phrases.*

The next criterion referred to by the lecturers was the alternative option. The faculty participants regarded some of the e-mail requests as impolite and inappropriate because a proper and appropriate strategy was not used; therefore, the lecturers provided an alternative strategy:

- Extract # 8
 - *The use of imperatives is not suitable. I would use another phrase such as would you, please.*
 - *Asking for marks is not acceptable. However, the polite requests can be made like please will you be considerate to change the mark because it may have a negative effect on my academics.*

The last criterion was organization. This criterion received the lowest degree of attention compared to the other criteria:

- Extract # 9
 - *The content of e-mail should start in a separate line.*

Additionally, the Comment sections for the framing moves were codified. The frequency of each is presented in Table 9:

Table 9.

Lecturers' Perceptions of Framing Moves

	E- Mail # 1	E- Mail # 2	E- Mail # 3	E- Mail # 4	E- Mail # 5	E- Mail # 6	E- Mail # 7	E- Mail # 8	E- Mail # 9	Total
Organization and format	8 (20%)	16 (44.4%)	16 (38.1%)	16 (40%)	26 (54.1%)	34 (65.3%)	32 (69.5%)	20 (71.4%)	18 (67.2%)	186 (68.9%)
Thanking	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (19.0%)	0 (0%)	2 (4.16%)	2 (3.84%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	12 (3.51%)
Interlocutors' characteristics and relationships	0 (0%)	10 (27.7%)	4 (9.52%)	4 (10%)	4 (8.33%)	4 (7.69%)	8 (17.3%)	2 (7.14%)	2 (7.69%)	38 (10.6%)
Language usage accuracy	16 (40%)	0 (0%)	2 (4.76%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (19.2%)	2 (4.35%)	2 (7.14%)	0 (0%)	32 (8.94%)
Alternative options	4 (10%)	6 (16.6%)	2 (4.76%)	2 (5%)	2 (4.16%)	2 (3.84%)	2 (4.35%)	2 (7.14%)	2 (7.69%)	24 (6.7%)
Appropriateness	8 (20%)	4 (11.1%)	8 (19.0%)	14 (35%)	12 (25%)	0 (0%)	2 (4.3%)	2 (7.14%)	4 (15.3%)	54 (15.0%)
Politeness	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (.55%)
Authenticity	4 (10%)	0 (0%)	2 (4.76%)	2 (5%)	2 (4.16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (2.79%)
Total	40 (100%)	36 (100%)	42 (100%)	40 (100%)	48 (100%)	52 (100%)	46 (100%)	28 (100%)	26 (100%)	358 (100%)

As seen in Table 9, the most common criterion is organization. For a request to seem polite and appropriate, it is supposed to have an organized body, along with the use of appropriate forms of address terms and closings:

- Extract # 10
 - *Greetings should be in a separate line.*

- *Keep the subject clear and depicting what's in e-mail and add a proper signature.*

The other frequent extracted criteria were appropriateness, interlocutors' characteristics and relationships, language usage accuracy, and alternative options. And, the least frequent criteria were politeness, authenticity, and thanking:

- Extract # 11
 - *Grammatical mistakes in the gratitude expressed in the ending show this learner do not have pragmatics and linguistic competence.*
 - *Using the term doctor in the opening is not perfectly appropriate.*

Whereas 20 (52.7%) lecturers considered E-mail # 1 as polite, 28 (73.7%) lecturers considered this e-mail as inappropriate. They supported their ratings by comments such as:

- Extract # 12
 - *Using my dear ostad is not suitable. The relationship with the professor should be strictly formal and professional. It is not acceptable to use my dear.*
 - *The opening is somehow problematic. It is not appropriate to use pronoun my when addressing your professor.*

As mentioned above, though E-mail # 1 was considered polite by half of the lecturers, it was considered inappropriate by most, indicating that using negative request strategies does not necessarily imply that an e-mail is appropriate. The lecturers supported this rating by providing reasons such as the L2 learners should have used formal address forms such as *Dear Dr. LN*. Of the other interesting findings related to this e-mail was the contradiction of the lecturers' views about the use of code-switching. Some mentioned that it is not appropriate to include the Persian word *ostad* (trans., professor); however, some suggested that it sounds appropriate. This contradiction of ideas indicates that L2 learners should be cautious when using Persian equivalents of words while communicating with their professors via e-mail.

The highest degree of agreement among the faculty participants' perceptions of the e-mail requests was achieved for polite e-mails (100%). Three e-mails (E-mails # 3, 4, and 9), out of 9, were considered polite and appropriate. The lectures supported their ratings by comments such as the followings:

- Extract # 13
 - *This e-mail observes the framing mechanisms in terms of initiating the e-mail, approaching the topic, and terminating the e-mail.*
 - *The e-mail is standard, and the student knows how to write a formal letter.*
 - *It is polite and appropriate. It includes different elements of a proper request. The reason is thoroughly has been explained, and the use of words such as kindly lowers the degree of imposition.*
 - *The writer has set the scene, followed by introducing the reason for her e-mail.*
 - *The moves are more clear-cut compared to former examples.*

However, some lectures mentioned that in E-mail # 3, the last name of the professor should be used after the word *professor*:

- Extract # 14
 - *I think this is among good e-mails. However, it is better to add the last name of the professor after the dear professor.*
 - *It would have been better if the name of the professor was included in the opening. Closing is appropriate.*

Organization and format, related to the appropriate use of openings and closings, were the most common criteria. This shows the importance of organization and format for the lecturers, supporting the results of the study by Zarei and Mohammadi (2012). It is worth noting that those e-mails in the questionnaire considered the politest and most appropriate e-mails by the faculty participants were written by the highly advanced L2 learners who had the experience of researching in pragmatics. This could

have led them to be more careful when mitigating their requests through e-mail.

E-mails # 6, 7, and 8 were considered the most impolite; however, the degree of agreement between the lecturers was not significant (63.2%, 63.2%, and 73.6%, respectively). E-mail # 8 was the most impolite request and the third inappropriate e-mail in which the L2 learner had wanted to call the professor to ask some questions. This type of request is considered among requests with low degrees of imposition. The lecturers provided different reasons for this choice. For example, one lecturer referred to the nature of the request (e.g., *Do not use "???" Ask if you can schedule an appointment or call don't decide yourself and be polite*). This e-mail appeared harsh, uninformative, direct, and impolite. Furthermore, the lack of address terms and inappropriate opening and closing moves were frequently mentioned by the lecturers.

The second most impolite e-mail was E-mail # 6 (the L2 learner had asked for a change in her grade). This e-mail is considered among requests for action with a high degree of imposition. The lecturers believed this e-mail sounded like a command and order. Formality, capitalization, punctuation, and grammar were the other factors that negatively affected the lecturers' perceptions. The underuse of closings and address terms, the inappropriate justification for her request, and the impolite nature of the request for a higher score were also mentioned by the lecturers for their negative perceptions of this e-mail.

In E-mail # 7, with a high level of imposition (that was a request for action), the lecturer was asked to send a few articles to the L2 learner. In their comments, the lecturers mentioned that their negative perceptions were due to the absence of proper opening and closing, grammatically wrong sentences, and ignoring the sociopragmatic norms of talking to a person of higher status. They believed the sender of this e-mail had not acknowledged the lecturer's social status, and the L2 learner had not shown respect for the lecturer's power and social distance, as the L2 learner was direct, rude, and used imperatives. Furthermore, the lecturers felt that this

e-mail was short, and the L2 learner should have added an explanation regarding what she had needed.

Discussion

The current study aimed at examining Iranian applied linguistics lecturers' perceptions/opinions of (in)appropriateness and (im)politeness of L2 learners' e-mail requests to faculty. The results indicated that different criteria such as language use accuracy, appropriateness, politeness, and directness had greatly influenced the faculty participants' perceptions/opinions of (in)appropriateness and (im)politeness of the L2 learners' e-mail requests to faculty.

The qualitative analysis of the Comment section of the questionnaire indicated that some of the lecturers believed that using *hi* and *hello* are not appropriate ways to start an e-mail (e.g., *Appropriate closing is missing. The body starts with hi which is not correct.*). These findings support those by Stephens et al. (2009) that suggested that sending casual e-mails is not advisable. This finding could suggest that lecturers prefer to keep their relationship with their students formal. Further, the results support previous research (e.g., Mohammadi, 2016), indicating that the most frequent types of openings employed by Iranian L2 learners are titles and last names.

In sum, framing moves (including salutations and closings) were frequently mentioned by the lecturers. Asking for a raise in grades negatively affected the lecturers' ratings. Such a finding provides further evidence that the lecturers often find it impolite and inappropriate when they are asked to raise their L2 learners' final grades (Stephens et al., 2009). Furthermore, the results are in line with previous research that the lecturers' ideal e-mail had to encompass the following e-mail structural components: salutations, openings, closings, proper grammar, and politeness cues (Bunz & Campbell, 2004; Waldvogal, 2007), as well as conciseness (Crowther & Goldhaber, 2001). The findings are consistent with Savic (2018), who reported that using the formal form of an address term such as *Ellis* is a determining factor regarding the appropriateness of

e-mail requests. This is in line with the findings of research on cultural and social norms, showing that in Eastern societies like Iran, social conventions are considered to be very important (Coulmas, 2005). Hence, formal salutations and address terms might lead Iranian professors to think that L2 learners are polite enough and are acknowledging their social status as professors.

Additionally, similar to the results in the study by Economidou-Kogetsidis (2011), the features that contributed to negative perceptions of the faculty participants for the content moves were inadequate explanations. The findings of this study indicate that the lack of elaborate modification may harm the sender's personality. Furthermore, direct strategies were viewed negatively by the lecturers. Using imperatives is considered inappropriate in e-mails written to the professor, as the degree of power has been ignored (Bloch, 2002). One of the lecturers mentioned that such a strategy is expected to be used by lecturers—not students.

Moreover, the occurrence of transferring Persian pragmatic norms such as *Sorry for troubling you* related to the openings of e-mails can arguably lead to sociopragmatic failure (Hashemian, 2012), as demonstrated by some of the lecturers' comments. However, it seems that using such a phrase is acceptable in the Persian context, as e-mails that contained such phrases (E-mails # 3 and 4) were considered both polite and appropriate. Two lecturers mentioned it seems that employing such phrases is appropriate in e-mails addressed to Iranian lecturers. Such a finding supports previous research (Hendriks, 2010). A possible explanation for the absence of adverse effects on the lecturers' perceptions might be that the e-mails in this study were identifiable as written by nonnative writers. This may have led the lecturers to ignore the differences between such pragmatic norms and what native-speakers use.

Furthermore, the results indicated that language use accuracy significantly influenced the lecturers' perceptions. The results are in line with previous research (e.g., Byron & Baldrige, 2007; Jessmer & Anderson, 2001) in that capitalization and grammatical accuracy are essential factors when mitigating requests via e-mail to faculty. The

findings shed light on the fact that the available cues in e-mails might lead the addressee to form a judgment about the addresser. The results of the current study suggest that using lower-case letters affects lecturers' perceptions of the sender more negatively if the content of the e-mail is not explicit (e.g., E-mail # 7).

The results of the present study, supporting those by McAndrew and De Jonge (2011), indicated that the lecturers had perceived the e-mails with inappropriate punctuations as impolite. This is probably due to the mechanics of writing (e.g., question marks), affecting how the addressee interprets an utterance (Trager, 1958). Such nonlinguistic signs are incorporated into texts to convey additional information. This is the same type of information that paralinguistic cues provide in face-to-face interaction. For example, as for E-mail # 8, the overuse of question marks negatively affected the lecturers' perceptions. Based on the lecturers' comments, in E-mail # 8, using "???" conveys that the sender of the e-mail must have felt anger. The faculty members indicated that by manipulating the punctuation of the sentence, the learner had tried to indicate her emotions.

In contrast with previous research (e.g., Alemi, Eslami, & Rezanejad, 2014), the findings of this study shed light on the lecturers' consistency in their ratings. Furthermore, the results indicate that there is a consistency between the lecturers' ratings and the criteria. The findings give support to Eslami and Eslami-Rasekh's claim (2008) in that pragmatic awareness can be developed with instruction.

Comparing the results of the second and third phases of this study, as Tables 4 and 6 indicate, the lecturers' ratings in the third phase are more consistent than the second phase. This is probably because the number of female lecturers was more than the males in the second phase of the study. Such differences are due to the psychological features of females. Females intend to be more meticulous and stricter than males. Accordingly, this feature might have affected their perceptions of (im)politeness and (in)appropriateness of the L2 learners' e-mail requests to faculty, as well.

In sum, the results also indicate that the lecturers' perceptions of (im)politeness and (in)appropriateness were affected by different factors (i.e., sociolinguistic and pragmalinguistic factors).

Conclusion

This study aimed to explore the lecturers' perceptions of requestive e-mails. The results indicated that 10 macro criteria affected their perceptions of the (in)appropriateness and (im)politeness of the e-mails: thanking, organization and format, explanation, interlocutors' characteristics and relationships, politeness, directness, appropriateness, alternative options, language usage accuracy, and authenticity. Furthermore, the findings revealed that the politest and most appropriate e-mails selected by the faculty participants were E-mails # 3, 4, and 9, whereas the most impolite and most inappropriate e-mails were E-mails # 6, 7, and 8. Appropriateness, language use accuracy, and explanation were the most frequent criteria that the faculty participants provided to support their ratings of the e-mails as (im)polite and (in)appropriate. Furthermore, examples of Persian pragmatic patterns were found; however, the lecturers found them appropriate to be used in the Iranian EFL context (not addressed to a native-speaker).

Despite the reliable and seemingly straightforward findings, this study suffers from several limitations: First, though the lecturers who volunteered to participate in this study were teaching at different universities in Iran, random sampling was not possible. Therefore, nonrandom sampling was utilized. This might have affected the results. Second, the e-mails chosen were written by female L2 learners to a male professor. As gender is a determining factor in pragmatic studies, future research can examine the (probable) effects of the gender of e-mail senders on lecturers' perceptions of (im)politeness and (in)appropriateness. Moreover, third, due to some limitations, triangulation was not possible. Retrospective interviews with lecturers can provide more insights into their perceptions of L2 learners' e-mail requests.

The results of the present study have significant implications for L2 teachers, materials developers, and researchers interested in pragmatics. Also, the findings can encourage further investigation of L2 lecturers' perceptions of politeness. Despite significant developments in ILP in recent years, there are still few studies regarding lecturers' perceptions of their L2 learners' e-mail requests. As lecturers' perceptions of politeness and appropriateness play an essential role, the findings of this study can help course designers to design pragmatic courses in line with lecturers' ideal perceptions of e-mail requests. Additionally, L2 learners must be aware of their lecturers' perceptions of politeness and appropriateness to be able to communicate with them properly. In conclusion, this study provides more insights on (best) ways to communicate with lecturers via e-mail, trying to grasp a way to match communication channels and content with lecturers' desires and communication styles.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our appreciation to many Iranian lecturers who contributed to this research. Our gratitude goes to them for responding with alacrity and professionalism to all the requests. Also, we are immensely grateful for their patience and cooperation.

References

- Abdi, R., Tavangar Rizi, M., & Tavakoli, M. (2010). The cooperative principle in discourse communities and genres: A framework for the use of metadiscourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 1669-1679.
- Alemi, M., Eslami, Z. R. & Rezanejad, A. (2015). Iranian nonnative English-speaking teachers' rating criteria regarding the speech act of compliment: An investigation of teachers' variables. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 33(3), 21-49.
- Biesenbach-Lucas, S. (2005). Communication topics and strategies in e-mail consultation: Comparison between American and international university students. *Language Learning & Technology*, 9(2), 24-46.

- Biesenbach-Lucas, S. (2007). Student writing e-mails to faculty: An examination of e-politeness among native and nonnative speakers of English. *Language Learning & Technology*, 11(2), 59-81.
- Bloch, J. (2002). Student/teacher interaction via e-mail: The social context of Internet discourse. *Online Journal of Second Language Writing*, 11, 117-134.
- Bolkan, S., & Holmgren, J. L. (2012). "You are such a great teacher, and I hate to bother you but . . .": Instructors' evaluations of students and their use of e-mail messages with varying politeness strategies. *Communication Education*, 61(3), 253-270.
- 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: Ablex.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bunz, U., & Campbell, S. W. (2004). Politeness accommodation in electronic mail. *Communication Research Reports*, 21, 11-25.
- Byron, K., & Baldridge, D. C. (2007). E-mail recipients' impressions of senders' likability: The interactive effect of nonverbal cues and recipients' personality. *Journal of Business Communication*, 44(2), 137-160.
- Chen, C. F. E. (2001). *Making e-mail requests to professors: Taiwanese vs. American students*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, St. Louis, United States.
- Coulmas, F. (2005). *Sociolinguistics: The study of speakers' choices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crowther, G., & Goldhaber, G. (2001). Face-to-face or e-mail: The medium makes a difference. *Communication World*, 18, 25-26.
- Crystal, D. (2001). *Language and the Internet*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Culpeper, J., Haugh, M., & Kadar, D. Z. (2017). *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness*. Macmillan, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

- Economidou-Kogetsidis, M. (2011). Please answer me as soon as possible: Pragmatic failure in nonnative speakers' e-mail requests to faculty. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(13), 3193-3215.
- Economidou-Kogetsidis, M. (2016). Variation in evaluations of the (im)politeness of e-mails from L2 learners and perceptions of the personality of their senders. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 106, 1-19.
- Eslami, Z. R. (2013). Online communication and students' pragmatic choices in English. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*, 9, 71-92.
- Eslami, Z. R. & Eslami-Rasekh, A. (2008). Enhancing the pragmatic competence of nonnative English-speaking teacher candidates in an EFL context. *Investigating Pragmatics in Foreign Language Learning, Teaching, and Testing*, 30(2), 178-197.
- Eslami, Z., R., Eslami-Rasekh, A., & Fatahi, A. (2004). The effect of explicit metapragmatic instruction on the speech act awareness of advanced EFL students. *TESL-EJ*, 8(20), 1-12.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2012). E-mail requests to faculty: E-politeness and internal modification. In M. Economidou-Kogetsidis & H. Woodfield (Eds.), *Interlanguage request modifiers* (pp. 87-118). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Fraser, B. (1975). Hedged performatives. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (pp. 44-68). New York: Academic Press.
- Fraser, B. (2010). Pragmatic competence: The case of hedging. In G. Kaltenböck, W. Mihatsch, & S. Schneider (Eds.), *New approaches to hedging* (pp. 15-34). London: Emerald.
- Hashemian, M. (2012). Cross-cultural differences and pragmatic transfer in English and Persian refusals. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 31(3), 23-46.
- Hashemian, M., & Farhang-Ju, M. (2017). A pragmatic study of speech acts by Iranian and Spanish English learners. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, 8, 14-20.
- Haugh, M., & Schneider, K. P. (2012). Im/politeness across English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44, 1017-1022.
- Hendriks, B. (2010). An experimental study of native speaker perceptions of nonnative request modification in e-mails in English. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 7(2), 221-255.

- Jalilifar, A. (2009). Request strategies: Cross-sectional study of Iranian EFL learners and Australian native speakers. *ELT Journal*, 2(1), 46-61.
- Jessmer, S., & Anderson, D. (2001). The effect of politeness and grammar on user perceptions of electronic mail. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 3, 331-346.
- Izadi, A., & Zilaie, F. (2012). Politeness strategies in e-mail exchanges in Persian. *Journal of Comparative Literature and Culture*, 2(1), 86-90.
- Kadar, D. Z., & Haugh, M. (2013). *Understanding politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. New York: Longman.
- Locher, M. (2004). *Power and politeness in action: Disagreements in oral communication*. Berlin: Mouton.
- McAndrew, F., & De Jonge, C. (2011). Electronic person perception: What do we infer about people from the style of their e-mail messages? *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 2(4), 403-407.
- Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Najeeb, Z. M., Maros, M., & Nor, N. F. M. (2012). Politeness in e-mails of Arab students in Malaysia. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*, 12(1), 125-145.
- Hayati, M., Shokouhi, H., & Hadadi, F. (2012). A genre analysis of reprint request e-mails written by EFL and physics professionals. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 30(3), 21-42
- Mohammadi, R. (2016). *A cross-cultural pragmatic study of salutation strategies and small talks in students' requestive e-mails to faculty: Iranian EFL and American contexts*. Unpublished master's thesis, Shahrekord University, Shahrekord, Iran.
- Parviz, M. (2012). Politeness accommodation in e-mail requests among Iranian postgraduate students of EFL. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 1(7), 127-136.
- Rue, Y. J. & Zhang, G. Q. (2008). *Request strategies. A comparative study in Mandarin Chinese and Korean*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Tajeddin, Z., & Alemi, M. (2012). Pragmatic rater training: Does it affect rating accuracy and consistency? *Iranian Journal of Language Testing*, 4(1), 66-83.
- Savic, M. (2018). Lecturer perceptions of im/politeness and in/appropriateness in student e-mail requests: A Norwegian perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 124, 52-72.
- Stephens, K., Houser, M., & Cowan, R. (2009). R U able to meat me: The impact of students' overly casual e-mail messages to instructors. *Communication Education*, 58(3), 303-326.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Trager, G. L. (1958). Paralanguage: A first approximation. *Studies in Linguistics*, 13, 1-12.
- Waldvogal, J. (2007). Greetings and closings in workplace e-mail. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12, 456-477.
- Zarei, G., & Mohammadi, M. (2012). E-politeness in Iranian English electronic requests to the faculty. *Research in Applied Linguistics*, 3(1), 3-24.
- Zou, X., & Leung, A. K. (2015). Enriching cultural psychology with research insights on norms and intersubjective representations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 46, 1238-1244.

Appendix Speech Act Questionnaire

Professor's Background:

- a. University Degree:
- b. Major:
- c. Age:
- d. Gender: Male Female
- e. Years of English Teaching Experience: 1-5 6-10 11+
- f. Nationality:
- g. Native Language:

Dear Professor: The followings are examples of e-mails, written by English language learners (EFL learners). Suppose that the following e-mails have been mailed to you by your students. Please read the learners' requests and rate their **POLITENESS** and **APPROPRIATENESS** according to the following rating scale. Then, please kindly provide your criteria and reasons for the selection of a particular point (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) on the scale. Then, please kindly provide your explanations and criteria for the framing moves and body of the e-mails. Framing moves include the subject, opening sequences (greeting, self-identification) and closing sequences (expressions of gratitude, good wishes, leave-taking, and signature).

E-mail # 1

Subject: [Resarch Qs]

Hello my dear Ostad

Could you please check the attached file? thank you so much

Best regards

student's name

APPROPRIATENESS: 1. Perfectly Appropriate 2. Appropriate 3. Neutral 4. Inappropriate
5. Very Inappropriate

POLITENESS: 1. Very polite, 2. Polite 3. Neutral 4. Impolite 5. Very Impolite

Criteria for framing moves:

Criteria for the body:

E-mail # 2

Subject: [student's name. writing presentation shift]

Hi doctor. Good night. I have prepared a PowerPoint for writing, but because I can not attend the class tomorrow, I asked mr X to read it if you accept. Thanks, student's name

APPROPRIATENESS: 1. Perfectly Appropriate 2. Appropriate 3. Neutral 4. Inappropriate
5. Very Inappropriate

POLITENESS: 1. Very polite 2. Polite 3. Neutral 4. Impolite
5. Very Impolite

Criteria for framing moves:

Criteria for the body:

E-mail # 3

Subject: [seeking guidance]

Dear Professor,

I hope you are doing well. Sorry for disruption. I am really in need of your assistance. I am trying to write my review article, but I cannot figure out how to summarize the article itself. Shall I include every part of the article? I will appreciate it if you kindly explain about it.

Truly Yours,
student's name

APPROPRIATENESS: 1. Perfectly Appropriate 2. Appropriate 3. Neutral 4. Inappropriate
5. Very Inappropriate

POLITENESS: 1. Very polite, 2. Polite 3. Neutral 4. Impolite 5. Very
Impolite

Criteria for framing moves:

Criteria for body:

E-mail # 4

Subject: [speech act]

Dear Professor X,

Hope you are doing well. Sorry for troubling you. I am in need of your guidance, as I always do. As for the speech acts, I am wondering what kind of instrument best suits the research? Suppose our topic is "Investigating ...". I thought the questionnaire would be fine, but some say it is not the best way to gather data. I am honored that I can really benefit from the wisdom of your experience. I will appreciate it if you kindly explain about it.

Sincerely Yours,
student's name

APPROPRIATENESS: 1. Perfectly Appropriate 2. Appropriate 3. Neutral 4. Inappropriate
5. Very Inappropriate

POLITENESS: 1. Very polite 2. Polite 3. Neutral 4. Impolite
5. Very Impolite

Criteria for framing moves:

Criteria for the body:

E-mail # 5

Subject: [Changing the subject of thesis]

Dear Professor,

Hi. its student's name. i mailed you about my thesis, so I guess I limited it (Compare and contrast the effects...). what do you think about that! If it's still not good enough, would you please please give me a hand...

Thank you so much . Good night

APPROPRIATENESS: 1. Perfectly Appropriate 2. Appropriate 3. Neutral 4. Inappropriate
5. Very Inappropriate

POLITENESS: 1. Very polite 2. Polite 3. Neutral 4. Impolite
5. Very Impolite

Criteria for framing moves:

Criteria for the body:

E-mail # 6

Subject: [REVISION]

Dear Instructor

Thanks your mark. May I ask you change my mark to fourteen. That mark effect on my average and become conditional three time or put to trouble position.

Thanks

APPROPRIATENESS: 1. Perfectly Appropriate 2. Appropriate 3. Neutral 4. Inappropriate
5. Very Inappropriate

POLITENESS: 1. Very polite, 2. Polite 3. Neutral 4. Impolite 5. Very
Impolite

Criteria for framing moves:

Criteria for the body:

E-mail # 7

Subject: [.]

Hello. Please send me the articles.

Thanks so much..

APPROPRIATENESS: 1. Perfectly Appropriate 2. Appropriate 3. Neutral 4. Inappropriate
5. Very Inappropriate

POLITENESS: 1. Very polite, 2. Polite 3. Neutral 4. Impolite 5. Very
Impolite

Criteria for framing moves:

Criteria for the body:

E-mail # 8

Subject: [Questions]

Hello. Do all my questions need revision??? Sorry, I should talk to you so I call you tomorrow.

Thanks.

APPROPRIATENESS: 1. Perfectly Appropriate 2. Appropriate 3. Neutral 4. Inappropriate
5. Very Inappropriate

POLITENESS: 1. Very polite 2. Polite 3. Neutral 4. Impolite 5. Very Impolite

Criteria for framing moves:

Criteria for body:

E-mail # 9

Subject: [Discourse analysis]

Dear Professor X,

Hope you are doing fine.

I wonder if it is possible to do my paper for Discourse Analysis course during summer. If yes, can I work on speech acts like request? I would like to do an experimental study. So, I need to do the data collection procedure during summer. I appreciate any guidance you offer.

Regards,

student's name

APPROPRIATENESS: 1. Perfectly Appropriate 2. Appropriate 3. Neutral 4. Inappropriate
5. Very Inappropriate

POLITENESS: 1. Very polite 2. Polite 3. Neutral 4. Impolite 5. Very Impolite

Criteria for framing moves:

Criteria for the body:

پروفیسر گاہ علوم انسانی و مطالعات فرہنگی
پرتال جامع علوم انسانی