

## **Manifesting the Reprimanding Response Behavior of Native Persian Speakers and EFL Learners Using Rapport Management Approach**

Fazlolah Samimi, Assistant Professor, Department of English, Bandar-Abbas Branch, Islamic Azad University, Bandar-Abbas, Iran  
*Fazl.samimi67@gmail.com*

Jalal Khoramrooz, M.A., Department of English, Bandar-Abbas Branch, Islamic Azad University, Bandar-Abbas, Iran  
*jkhoramrooz@yahoo.com*

### **Abstract**

Using Spencer-Oatey's (2004, 2008) Rapport Management approach, this study was conducted to elicit the reprimanding response behavior of native Persian speakers and EFL Learners. The participants of this study were 30 native Persian speakers and 60 EFL learners. To fulfill the purposes of this study, a six-binary situation Interactive Discourse Completion (IDCT) Task was utilized. Emotion Likert-Scales such as the anger, responsibility, fairness and selfishness were also included to the end of IDCT. The findings depict that native Persian speakers take a rapport threatening perspective by claiming autonomy and violating association and involvement principles. They also manifest a rapport enhancing perspective by observing cost-benefit considerations. EFL learners, on the other hand, claim autonomy and violate respect and involvement components. They also respect identity face of interlocutors more than do their Native Persian counterparts.

**Keywords:** Rapport Management Approach, reprimand reactions, DCT

### **Introduction**

Speech act has been characterized as the particular intention behind the performance of an activity and the influence it hence leaves on the part of listeners (Crystal, 1992). This particular intention, however, cannot be grasped solely from the word-order meaning of sentence components, but rather the blend of sentence components' meaning and pragmatics. Pragmatics indicates which forms having what functions should be merged hand in hand in order for an intention to be comprehended (Capone, 2010; Capone & Salmani, 2014). In other words, in our daily activities, we use many speech acts whose genuine meaning can not only be attached to semantic loading. As a result, communicative acts are sum of speech act and semantic meanings; one of such speech acts is reprimand response behaviors.

Reprimands like criticisms are naturally taken as impolite and their performance hence swarm and depreciate the positive face desires of interlocutors (Haverkate, 1998). Brown and Levinson (1987) postulate that the depreciation of positive face takes place as the speaker denotes a mal-performance or an unjustified duty required of hearer.

Face wants dichotomy once was considered to be universal (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Contrary to the very fact, the realization of which strategy as to save one's face desires and hence augments rapport can fluctuate from one situation to another, culture to culture (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998; Bond, Žegarac & Spencer-Oatey, 2000), but EFL learners might override the importance of face wants according to its particular situation and as a matter of fact, carry over certain assumption, beliefs, and norms from L1 into the context of L2 communication which sounds more oriented toward speaker's native language rather than the target one they are acquiring (Beebe, Takahashi, & Uliss- Weltz, 1990). The same might be true about reprimand reactions.

### Literature Review

A couple of studies have investigated reprimand reactions up to date. Garcia (1996) analyzed the responses of role plays of Peruvians when reprimanding or being reprimanded and found that when responding to reprimands they expressed respect. In addition, Allami and Samimi (2014) in a study of reprimand responses among intermediate and advanced EFL learners realized that intermediate learners not only demand their privacy to be maintained, but they are also against limitation and control. Empathy articulating and involvement as well as respect infringing are more vivid among intermediate EFL learners, while their advanced counterparts depict more cost-benefit considerations. Moreover, Ahmadian and Vahid Dastjerdi (2010) performed an empirical study about the perception of Americans and Iranians as to the reprimand and reprimand responses. The results fed into differences between the two cultures and hence required appropriate instruction for Iranian EFL learners.

Although, the study of reprimand and reprimand reactions have already been investigated concerning Goffman (1976) and Brown and Levinson's models (1989) viewing politeness as being face sensitive generally as a universal feature, the comparison of reprimand reactions among Native Persians and EFL learners has not lent itself to inquiries from a Rapport Management Perspective (2000, 2004). As a result, this study intends to foreground the transfer of reprimand response strategies from Persian native speakers to the learner's language using a rapport management approach proposed by Spencer-Oatey (2000, 2004). This study uses Spencer-Oatey's (2004) rapport management approach to analyze learners' perceived responses to reprimands in terms of behavioral expectations, face sensitivity and interactional wants.

This approach was preferred over Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness model since Spencer-Oatey (2000) provides elaborated components for her model to which human utterances can be attributed and referred. It also surpasses the categorization of face into positive and negative dichotomies, the evaluation of which accounted for politeness and takes into account the social perspectives of face too, and thus studies how social relationships are established, maintained and threatened by our performing of utterances. Further, Spencer-Oatey (2008) asserts the failure or success of a communicative event relies upon behavioral expectations, face wants and interactional wants. In other words, This approach moves from a personally-oriented evaluation of politeness in term of face indeed to a more dynamic one, striking a balance between self and others (Spencer, 2008).

Behavioral expectations, therefore, according to Spencer-Oatey (2008) are based on what people residing in a special society refuse, allow, or strongly favor as the sound behavior that conforms to the norms of each community. Such expectations may not be also universal, variations as to the cultural norms of each community might be observed. This study, however, concentrates on the illocutionary domain of pragmatics which deals with the performance of different speech acts, i.e. here, the responses to reprimands. Behavioral expectations according to Spencer-Oatey (2008) fall into two categorizations: the equity principle and the association principle.

The former aims to establish equal and fair rights for the individual as well as a right for independence, to be free from imposition, the latter, however, perceives a right for every individual to get a rather fair amount of interaction; therefore, in a sense not to be ignored while interacting with others (Spencer-Oatey, 2008). The equity principle thus involves: "cost-benefit considerations (the principle that people should not be exploited or disadvantaged), fairness-reciprocity (the belief that costs and benefits should be "fair" and kept roughly in balance), and autonomy-control (the belief that people should not be unduly controlled or imposed upon) (p.

100).” The association also encompasses: “involvement (the principle that people should have appropriate amounts and types of “activity” involvement with others), empathy (the belief that people should share appropriate concerns, feelings and interests with others), and respect (the belief that people should show appropriate amounts of respectfulness for others)” (p. 100).

Spencer-Oatey (2005) made a sharp distinction between respectability face and identity face : Respectability face is “the prestige, honor or ‘good name’ that a person or social group holds and claims within a broader community” (p. 102), and “reflects attributes such as biographical variables, relational attributes, social status indicators, formal title /position / rank, personal integrity” (p. 103). Identity face, on the other hand, is based on Goffman’s (1967) concept of face, which he defined as being based on the positive social values that people associate with their various self-aspects. These may include, in Spencer- Oatey’s model, bodily features and control, possessions and belonging performance/skills, social behavior and verbal behavior. Interactional wants, the third component in Spencer-Oatey’s rapport-management approach, can be either transactional or relational. Therefore, the current inquiry tries to shed more light on the above issues, posing the following questions:

- Q1. What are the reprimand response strategies used by EFL learners?
- Q2. What are the reprimand response strategies used by native Persian speakers?
- Q3. Are there any differences in strategy use among native Persian speakers and EFL learners?

## Methodology

### Design

This study enjoyed a sequential mixed method design in which both the qualitative and quantitative data were collected simultaneously through an IDCT. Then, the qualitative responses were transformed into frequency counts. Therefore, getting to know Persian and EFL learners’ reprimanding response behaviors constitutes the heuristic-based part of this study. The quantitative section of this inquiry goes on to investigate the possible differences, if any, in terms of reprimanding response behaviors among the two groups.

### Participants

The participants of this study were 30 Native Persian speakers and 60 upper intermediate EFL learners. Persian native speakers were chosen based upon convenient sampling. EFL learners, on the other hand, were picked up according to a cluster random sampling from Bandar-abbas and Kerman Provinces. Also, the level of participants was delineated via a Nelson English Test.

### Instruments

To commence the research project, a Nelson English language test was administered to homogenize the EFL participants of this study. Also, to collect the required data about reprimanding response behaviors of Native Persians and EFL learners, a six-binary situation Interactive Discourse Completion (IDCT) Task and its Persian translation developed by Allami and Samimi (2014) was modified and utilized. It is worth mentioning that the design of IDCT was based on the real observations of people reprimanding one another. Then, some real instances of people reprimanding one another were included in the IDCT. To assure the English and Persian translated IDCTs were valid in terms of face and content, they were reviewed by three specialists and they agreed that it was suitable to tap into reprimanding response strategies. Concerning reliability of both IDCTs, the reliability analysis was conducted and indexes of .68

and .72 for Persian translated IDCT and the English one were reached respectively (Appendices, C & D). Hence, they enjoy a fair degree of reliability as well.

Emotion Likert-Scales such as the anger, responsibility, fairness and selfishness were also included to the end of IDCT in order to evaluate how angry, selfish and fair, the participants assume the reprimanding party was and how responsible they are. For Persian native speakers, the English IDCT followed by the attached emotion Likert-scales was translated into Persian using back translation taking into account the equality of meaning as well as suitability to learners' culturally-laden viewpoints .

### Data Collection Procedures

To begin, EFL learners of English whose level was confirmed as a result of a Nelson English language test were administered IDCTs at Shokuh Language institute in Bandar-Abbas and Kish Air language institute in Kerman. A 45-minute slot was allotted in order for the participants to provide their written answers. The researchers assisted learners in case they faced any ambiguities.

Also, the translated version of IDCT was distributed among 30 ordinary Persian native speakers who were asked if they knew any English. After the researchers were assured that the Persian native speakers have not received any formal English, to whom Persian IDCTs were distributed and were assured the results of this inquiry would be used for research purposes.

### Data Analysis Procedures

After collecting the IDCTs, the written questionnaires were analyzed and coded according to the rubric provided by Allami and Samimi (2014). This rubric includes IFID, admission of responsibility, intermediate responsibility, rejection of responsibility, managing the problem examples and other responsibility-related examples as the qualitative data analysis. To assure the dependability of the data, the process of assigning answers to the pre-identified rubric was checked by two more coders. In fact, the coders rechecked 20 percent of the gathered data and agreement among the coders was reached in 95 percent of occasions. In addition, to perform the quantitative analysis, the researchers then counted the frequency for each and every rubric-subcategory for both Persian and EFL learners' responses. Finally, to epiphanize if any difference exists among Persian natives and EFL learners in terms of reprimand responses, a Chi-Square would be run.

### Qualitative Results

In this section, real examples taken from IDCTS are given.

**1. IFID:** Illocutionary force indicating device

**Example:** Mr. Tannen, I am really sorry.

**2. Admission of responsibility:** accepting the reprimand issued toward someone.

**Example:** ok sir, you are right

**3. Intermediate responsibility:** this strategy includes explanation and providing a pretext for the wrong doing, in other words, the participants neither fully accept nor deny the responsibility; rather they try to justify their wrong doing.

**Example:** Sorry, My father got stuck in the traffic. (Justifying)

Sorry, we had family problems, my father were sick (justifying).

**4. Denying responsibility:** In this case, the participants by no means assume any responsibilities and may talk back with their superior.

**Example:** I am always on time and you are given wrong information, sir.

**5. Other responsibility related examples:** in this case, you simply postpone the admission or denying the responsibility after getting to know more about the matter.

**Example:** I talk to him and let you know.

**6. Managing the problem examples:** you simply try to manage the problem and try to appease the reprimanding person and simply query for another opportunity to compensate for the problem occurring.

**Example:** give him one more opportunity, he will defiantly do his best.

**Table1.** *Native Persian Reprimand Response Strategies*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid IFID	4	1.1	1.1	1.1
Responsibility	1	.3	.3	1.4
Admission of responsibility	93	26.7	26.7	28.2
Intermediate responsibility	66	19.0	19.0	47.1
Denying responsibility	122	35.1	35.1	82.2
Other responsibility examples	7	2.0	2.0	84.2
Manage problem example	55	15.8	15.8	100.0
Total	348	100.0	100.0	

As Table 1 reveals, native Persian reprimanding response behaviors include IFID, admission of responsibility, intermediate responsibility, denying responsibility, other responsibility related examples, and managing the problem related examples, among which the highest frequency is attributed to denying responsibility (35.1%). Admission of responsibility with a lower extent stands at the second place (26.7%). Intermediate responsibility (19%) and managing the problem examples (15.5%) go for the third and fourth places. Other responsibility related examples with 2% and IFID with 1 % form the least rate of occurrences among reprimanding response behaviors of Native Persian speakers.

Analysis of Emotion Likert-scale concerning Anger, Responsibility, Fairness and selfishness among Native Persian speakers.

**Table 2.** *Likert-Scale Evaluation of Anger by Persian Native Speakers*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Not at all angry	6	3.4	3.4	3.4
Not much angry	19	10.9	10.9	14.4
Neutral	31	17.8	17.8	32.2

Angry	63	36.2	36.2	68.4
Very angry	55	31.6	31.6	100.0
Total	174	100.0	100.0	

Native Persians' description of anger via Likert-scale supports the fact that "Angry" scale is evaluated as having the highest rate of frequency (36% approximately), "Very angry" scale occupies the second place (32% approximately). Not at all angry and not much angry (3% and 11% approximately) are among the lowest rate of occurrences.

**Table 3.** *Likert-Scale Evaluation of Responsibility Degree by Persian Native Speakers*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Not at all responsible	20	11.5	11.5	11.5
Not much responsible	18	10.3	10.3	21.8
Neutral	42	24.1	24.1	46.0
Responsible	60	34.5	34.5	80.5
Very much responsible	34	19.5	19.5	100.0
Total	174	100.0	100.0	

Table 3 describes "responsible" scale (34.5%) as the highest ranked scale by respondents. "Neutrality (24.1%) and "very much responsible" (19.5%) form the other highest rate of occurrences after "responsible scale". "Not much responsible" and "not at all responsible" (10.3%, 11.5%) achieve the lowest occurrences.

**Table 4.** *Likert-Scale Evaluation of Fairness Degree by Persian Native Speaker*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Not at all fair	37	21.3	21.3	21.3
Not much fair	43	24.7	24.7	46.0
Neutral	21	12.1	12.1	58.0
Fair	64	36.8	36.8	94.8
Very much fair	9	5.2	5.2	100.0
Total	174	100.0	100.0	

Concerning the lowest rate of fairness degree, we find "Very much fair" (5.2%). Also, "neutrality" (12%) is attributed as the second lowest frequency. The average rated fairness degrees are "not much fair (24.7%) and "not at all fair" (21.3%). The highest one as Table 4 shows is "fair" scale (36.8%).

**Table 5.** *Likert-Scale Evaluation of Selfishness Degree by Persian Native Speakers*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Not at all conceited	33	19.0	19.0	19.0
Not much conceited	38	21.8	21.8	40.8
Neutral	44	25.3	25.3	66.1
Conceited	40	23.0	23.0	89.1
Very much conceited	19	10.9	10.9	100.0
Total	174	100.0	100.0	

“Neutrality” (25% approximately) as the above table displays is the highest rated scale by respondents. “Very much conceited” is, however, the lowest rated scale (11% approximately). “Conceited” scale (23% approximately, “not much conceited” (22% approximately), and “not at all conceited” (19 % approximately) also stand as the other rated frequencies by respondents.

### Results for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Research Question

**Table 6.** *EFL Learners' Reprimanding Response Strategies*

EFL learners	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid IFID	29	4.2	4.2	4.2
Admission of responsibility	150	21.6	21.6	25.7
Intermediate responsibility	140	20.1	20.1	45.8
Denying responsibility	242	34.8	34.8	80.6
Other responsibility examples	31	4.5	4.5	85.1
Manage problem example	104	14.9	14.9	100.0
Total	696	100.0	100.0	

On the whole, out of 696 or 100 % strategy use in this study, the participants utilize IFID strategy in 29 situations or 4.2 %. Admission of responsibility is also exploited in 150 situations, or 21%. Intermediate responsibility as the other strategy at the disposal of EFL learners is consumed in 140 cases or 20.1%. Denying responsibility, on the other hand, constitutes 34.8 % of strategy consumption in this study. Other responsibility related examples and managing the problem examples form 4.5% and 14.9 % (31 and 104 times, respectively) of strategy frequency among EFL Learners. Reporting the percentage of each strategy, it is therefore, inferred that denying responsibility (34.8%) is the most frequently used strategy among EFL learners; however, IFID (4.2%) and other responsibility related examples (4.5%) are the least utilized strategies among EFL learners.

### Analysis of Emotion Likert-scale concerning Anger, Responsibility, Fairness and selfishness among EFL Learners

**Table7.** Anger Likert-Scale Evaluation by EFL Learners

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Not at all angry	22	6.3	6.3	6.3
Not much angry	28	8.0	8.0	14.4
Neutral	51	14.7	14.7	29.0
Angry	114	32.8	32.8	61.8
Very angry	133	38.2	38.2	100.0
Total	348	100.0	100.0	

As Table 7 depicts, participants evaluated “very angry” (38.2%) and “angry” (32.8%) as the highest scales. However, “not at all angry” (6.3%) and “not much angry” (8%) were among the lowest evaluated scales.

**Table 8.** Overall Responsibility Degree of Respondents across a Five Point Likert-Scale

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Not at all responsible	61	17.5	17.5	17.5
Not much responsible	36	10.3	10.3	27.9
Neutral	62	17.8	17.8	45.7
Responsible	115	33.0	33.0	78.7
Very much responsible	74	21.3	21.3	100.0
Total	348	100.0	100.0	

As demonstrated in Table 8, the “responsible” scale (33%) was selected as the highest scale. The second highest rated scale, as Table 3.8 displays, is “not much responsible” (21.3%). The lowest rated responsibility scale is “not at all responsible” (10.3%). The “neutral” scale (17.8%) and “not at all responsible” (10.3%) were assessed as the average responsibility degrees.

**Table 9.** The Overall Fairness Degree of Respondents across a Five Point Likert-Scale

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Not at all angry	73	21.0	21.0	21.0
Not much angry	75	21.6	21.6	42.5
Neutral	102	29.3	29.3	71.8

Angry	64	18.4	18.4	90.2
Very angry	34	9.8	9.8	100.0
Total	348	100.0	100.0	

As shown in Table 9, the fairness degree of respondents, the highest degree of which is characterized as “neutral” (29.3%), the lowest “very angry” (9.8%), has been displayed here. The average assessed scales are “not much fair” (21.6%), “not at all fair (21%), and “fair (18.4%).

**Table10.** *Selfishness Degree of Respondents over a Five Point Likert-Scale*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Not at all conceited	58	16.7	16.7	16.7
Not much conceited	62	17.8	17.8	34.5
Neutral	71	20.4	20.4	54.9
Conceited	84	24.1	24.1	79.0
Very much conceited	73	21.0	21.0	100.0
Total	348	100.0	100.0	

The highest rate of frequency goes for “conceited” (24.1%) scale. The lowest, however, is “not at all conceited” (16.7%). The other scales placed at the second to the fourth ranks are “very much conceited” (21%), “neutral” (20.4%) and “much” (16.7%).

### Quantitative Results

#### Results for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Research Question

Totally IDCT had 12 situations (a six binary DCT) and it was probable for a learner to use more than one strategy in a situation. Utmost, 2 strategies, if used, were considered to be elicited for every situation. Since there were 60 EFL learners and 30 Persian natives, the use and non-use of the strategies were extracted and the following table reports on the descriptive part.

**Table 11.** *Chi-Square tests*

			strategy		Total
			use	nonuse	
group	Persian Natives	Count	348	372	720
		Expected Count	351.9	368.1	720.0
		% within group	48.3%	51.7%	100.0%
		% within strategy	33.3%	34.1%	33.7%
		% of Total	16.3%	17.4%	33.7%
EFL learners	Count	696	720	1416	
	Expected Count	692.1	723.9	1416.0	
	% within group	49.2%	50.8%	100.0%	

	% within strategy	66.7%	65.9%	66.3%
	% of Total	32.6%	33.7%	66.3%
Total	Count	1044	1092	2136
	Expected Count	1044.0	1092.0	2136.0
	% within group	48.9%	51.1%	100.0%
	% within strategy	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	48.9%	51.1%	100.0%

As indicated in Table 11, 48.3 percent of Persian Natives used reprimand response strategies, while 51.7 percent did not use reprimand response strategies concerning two possible strategies for each and every situation to be extracted. The reason why the researchers decided to count two strategies for each situation was the fact that more than one strategy was utilized by some participants to answer a particular reprimand. EFL learners, on the other hand, used 49.2 percent of strategies at their disposal and 50.8 percent of possible strategies were not consumed by EFL Learners.

**Table 12.** *Inferential statistics concerning strategy use among Persian natives and EFL learners.*

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.128 <sup>a</sup>	1	.720		
Continuity Correction <sup>b</sup>	.098	1	.755		
Likelihood Ratio	.128	1	.720		
Fisher's Exact Test				.749	.377
Linear-by-Linear Association	.128	1	.720		
N of Valid Cases	2136				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 351.91.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

A Chi-square for independence was applied to realize whether the two groups are statistically different. Since the p value is larger than 0.05, we can assume two groups are not different in terms of strategy use ( $p=.72$ ,  $df =1$ ).

### Discussion

The foremost strategy utilized by native Persian speakers is denying responsibility. It corroborates claiming autonomy component of behavioral expectations as proposed by Spencer-Oatey (2005). In other words, respondents did not admit the particular reprimand issued toward them and, thus, rejected any responsibilities. It can be inferred that they did not take a rapport enhancing perspective, but, they stopped the mainstream of communication and, consequently, took a rapport threatening behavior.

Denying responsibility besides claiming autonomy can be explained in terms of association principle of sociality rights and obligations (Spencer-Oatey (2005). Put it differently,

one's failure to perform certain obligations properly has deserved a reprimand, hence, its denying, is discerned as violating the association principle of sociality rights and regulations since they fail to respect and get involved with their superiors. As a result, it causes resentment and this is not the face that damages. Part of this result can be explained in terms of cultural features of Persian speakers to put the ball in someone else's ground.

Admission of responsibility is the second highest strategy utilized by native Persian speakers and demonstrates Persian natives after claiming autonomy would have been prone to respect cost-benefit issues. In other words, they admitted the reprimand in order to provide merits to the reprimanding person. In fact, they take into account the superior's right to issue criticisms for their wrong doing and admit it as a sign of obligation for which they have failed to work out properly.

The average strategies utilized by native Persian speakers are intermediate responsibility and managing the problem examples. Therefore, Persian Natives obeys the respect and involvement components of association principle in particular and the sociality rights and obligations of Spencer-Oaty (2004) in general. As a result, by providing explanation and justification, the inferior attempts to take a rapport enhancing behavior, the infringement of which could have brought about resentment and thus considered an impolite act which Brown and Levinson's model lacks any component to which they could be attributed. The results partly contradict Garcia (1996) analyzing the responses of role plays of Peruvians when being reprimanded, since Peruvians followed deferential approaches, however, Native Persians claimed autonomy mostly.

Another aim of this study was to identify the reprimanding response strategies used by EFL learners. The findings demonstrate that EFL learners performed rapport threatening behaviors by claiming autonomy and violating respect and involvement components of the association principle. The results of this study are in line with Allami and Samimi's (2014) study in that intermediate EFL Learners claimed autonomy and infringed respect and involvement components. Among rapport enhancing behaviors namely, IFID, admission of responsibility, intermediate responsibility and managing the problem examples, the results revealed that, EFL learners utilize IFID in more cases than do native Persians (1%) and are more apt to respect the identity face of the interlocutors.

EFL learners, however, manifest admission of responsibility to a lesser extent than their native Persian counterparts (26.7%) and this suggests they observe cost-benefit considerations in an attempt to take a rapport enhancing perspective. Intermediate responsibility, on the other hand, is at the disposal of EFL learners and native Persians (19%). Therefore, they observe involvement and respect components as well. Finally, managing problem examples is balanced among EFL learners and native Persians (15.5%). It reveals EFL learners respect the empathy component and take a relational approach rather than an interactional one. Respecting empathy components was also observed in Allami and Samimi's (2014) study.

Emotion Liker-scale evaluation as to compare Persian natives and their EFL counterparts revealed concerning anger degree of the reprimanding person, EFL participants rated "Very angry" as the highest scale whereas native Persians assessed "angry" scale as being the same. Also, for the fairness degree, EFL learners rated "neutrality" as having the highest rate of occurrence; however, the same for native Persians was "fair" scale.

Moreover, Both Persians natives and EFL learners rated "responsible" scale as the highest choice. Furthermore, regarding the selfishness degree of the reprimanding person, EFL participants favored "conceitedness"; however, their Persian native counterparts evaluated "Neutral" as the most frequently used scale on the five-point Likert-scale. As a result, The results

obtained from DCT regarding transfer are corroborated here since the emotional derives of the EFL respondents and Persian natives, as the findings of Emotion Liker-scale displayed, are different, but we observe the same strategies both groups have been utilized.

The third research question of this study aimed to find out if EFL learners and Persian native speakers use the same reprimanding response behaviors. Findings showed the same strategies have been utilized by EFL learners and Persian native speakers. Therefore, to identify whether pragmatic transfer was involved, the Chi-Square tests were applied and revealed that the differences between the two groups were not significant  $p > 0.05$ .

### Conclusions

Regarding methodological implications, the findings of this study revealed reprimanding response strategies are common as to the type among Persian speakers and EFL learners. In other words, pragmatic transfer is at play among EFL learners when to want to respond to a reprimand. Therefore, it can be suggested as a hint to EFL teachers and students to be more concerned about pragmatic errors, as Wolfson (1989) is of the idea that pragmatic errors results in serious communication failures and they might be seen as an offence. Also, Contrary to the idea of Bardovi- Harling (1999) that EFL teachers should focus students' attention toward linguistic errors than the pragmatic one, it can be concluded that linguistic errors such as pronunciation and grammar can be easily skipped. As a result, teachers as direct practitioners of language in academic settings are, thus, suggested to raise EFL learners' pragmatic awareness alongside their proficiency level.

In other words, as learners' level enhances, pragmatic aspects, besides linguistic issues, should be instructed to them via audio-visual activities which expose learners to authentic materials. Although learners' access to authentic language is either limited or is totally unlikely, the aforementioned teaching techniques, if systematically planned, may not only raise pragmatic awareness of learners but increase their pragmatic understanding. Kasper and Rose (1999) also noted the beneficial effect of instruction of pragmatic norms in some studies. Also, students as other practitioners of language can benefit from explicit instructions, as their interaction of whom with native English speakers is minute.

Also, other studies have corroborated the efficacy of explicit instruction on learners' pragmatic awareness (Cohen & Ishihara, 2013; García, 1996). In addition, the findings can provide text book writers with precious guidelines so as to be included in text books in terms of reprimand response strategies in particular and the speech act realizations in general. One factor, however, which could have raised the validity of this research, was the use of other instruments such as role-plays and interviews. Future studies can replicate this study using the other instruments to elicit naturally occurring data.

### References

- Ahmadian, M. J., & Vahid Dastjerdi, H. (2010). A comparative study of perception of politeness of American reprimands by Iranian EFL learners and Americans. *The Social Sciences*, 5(4), 359-363.
- Allami, H., & Samimi, F. (2014). Rapport Management Approach to Reprimand: Intermediate Vs. Advanced EFL Learners. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 220-224.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., (1999). The interlanguage of interlanguage pragmatics: a research agenda for acquisitional pragmatics. *Language Learning* 49, 677–713.

Beebe, L.M., Takahashi, T., and Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R.C. Scarcella, E.S. Anderson, and S.D. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 55-94). New York: Newbury House Publishers.

Bond, M., Žegarac, V., & Spencer-Oatey, H. (2000). Culture as an explanatory variable: Problems and possibilities. In H. Spencer-Oatey (Ed.), *Culturally speaking: Managing rapport through talk across cultures* (pp.47-71). New York: Continuum.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In E.N. Goody (Ed.) *Questions and politeness* (pp. 56–324) Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Capone, A. (2010). On pragmemes again: Dealing with death. *La Linguistique* 46, 3-21.

Capone, A., & Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2014). On indirect reports and language games: Evidence from Persian. *Rivista Italiana di Filosofia del Linguaggio*, 8(2), in press

Cohen, A., & Ishihara, N. (2013). Pragmatics. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Applied linguistics and materials development* (pp. 113-126). London: Bloomsbury..

Crystal, D. (1992). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* (3rd ed.). London: Blackwell

García, C. (1996). Reprimanding and responding to a reprimand: a case study of Peruvian Spanish speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26, 663–697.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. New York, NY: Random House.

Haverkate, H. (1988). Toward a typology of politeness strategies. *Multilingua*, 7(4), 385-409.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (1999). Pragmatics and SLA. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 19, 81-104.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2000). Rapport management: a framework for analysis. *Culturally Speaking. Managing Rapport through Talk across Cultures*. Continuum, London, pp. 11–46.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2004). *Culturally speaking*: Continuum Intl Pub Group

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2005). (Im)Politeness, face and perceptions of rapport: Unpackaging their bases and interrelationships. *Journal of Politeness Research* 1(1), 95–119.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2008). Theories of identity and the analysis of face. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 39(4): p. 639-656.

Ting-Toomey, S., & Kurogi, A. (1988). Facework competence in intercultural conflict: an updated face-negotiation theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 22(2), 187-225.

Wolfson, N. (1981). Invitations, compliments, and the competence of the native speakers. *International Journal of Psycholinguistics*, 8, 7-22.

## Appendix A

### Situation 1

You are working at an international company. This morning, your boss, David Brown, asks you to talk to him in his office. He is reprimanding you for your having been coming late to work, leaving early and not doing your work.

But you do not agree with him.

David Brown: I see in the personnel manager's report here where he tells me that you are coming late, you don't complete your job and leave before quitting time. I want to know what the cause of these problems is. We will have to take severe steps if you can't give me a good explanation for this.

You would say: .....

David Brown: No excuse again. I heard that you always leave office early and do not finish your work. Behave yourself!

You would say:.....

1) In situation 1, how angry do you think David Brown is?

1. Not at all angry      2      3      4      5. Very angry

2) How far do you feel responsible for the problem occurring?

1. Not at all responsible      2      3      4      5. Very much responsible

3. How far do you feel the reprimand made is fair?.

1. No at all fair      2      3      4      5. Very much fair

4. How much do you think the man reprimanding you is conceited (selfish)?

1. Not at all conceited      2      3      4      5. very much conceited

## Appendix B

به نام خدا

موقعیت ششم:

پدر شما خانه را به مقصد کار در زمان نرمال ترک میکنند شما به طور تصادفی از رادیوی محلی میشنوید که یک تصادف در مسیری که پدرتان به محل کار خود می روند اتفاق افتاده است و حرکت قطارها با تاخیر انجام می شود. بعد از آن تلفن شما زنگ میخورد. مدیر پدر شما پشت خط است او با عصبانیت میگوید:

مدیر: من میخوام بدونم پدرت کدوم گوریه قرار بوده واسه جلسه گروهمون اینجا باشه. همه ما ۳۰ دقیقه است که معطلشون هستیم. چه اتفاقی واسش افتاده؟

پاسخ شما

.....

در هر حال دیر رسیدنش قابل بخشش نیست و آگه تا ساعت ۸ اینجا نباشه باید با کارش توی این شرکت خداحافظی کنه.

پاسخ شما:

.....

در موقعیت ششم فکر می کنید که مدیر شرکت تا چه حد عصبانی است؟ ۱.

۱. اصلا عصبانی نیستند.      ۲. خیلی عصبانی نیستند      ۳. عادی هستند      ۴. عصبانی هستند      ۵. به شدت عصبانی هستند.

۲. تا چه حد در قبال مشکل بوجود آمده احساس مسئولیت میکنید؟

۱. به هیچ عنوان      ۲. خیلی احساس مسئولیت نمیکنم      ۳. نه مسئولم و نه مقصر      ۴. مسئولیت ان را به عهده میگیرم.      ۵. بسیار زیاد.

۳. تا چه اندازه فکر میکنید که سرزنش شما منصفانه بوده است؟

۱. به هیچ وجه      ۲. خیلی منصفانه نیست      ۳. نه منصفانه و نه بی انصافی است      ۴. منصفانه است      ۵. خیلی منصفانه است.

؟

. تا چه اندازه فکر میکنید که فرد سرزنش کننده خودخواه است

. ۲. خیلی خودخواه نیست

. به هیچ عنوان

. ۵. خیلی خودخواه

. ۳. نه خودخواه و نه سر به زیر

. ۴. خودخواه

**Appendix C****Appendix 3****Reliability Statistics for English IDCT**

Cronbach's Alpha <sup>a</sup>	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items <sup>a</sup>	N of Items
.72	.73	12

**Appendix D****Reliability Statistics for Persian IDCT**

Cronbach's Alpha <sup>a</sup>	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items <sup>a</sup>	N of Items
.68	.69	12

شعبه پژوهشگاه علوم انسانی و مطالعات فرهنگی  
پرتال جامع علوم انسانی