

## The Relationship between Cultural Intelligence and Expressions of Gratitude among Iranian Upper-Intermediate EFL Learners

**Oranoos Rezaei\***

Department of Foreign Languages  
M.A in TEFL  
Islamic Azad University, Shiraz Branch  
Shiraz, Iran  
Email: oranoos.rezaei@gmail.com

**Mohammad Bavali**

Department of English Language  
Assistant Professor  
Islamic Azad University, Shiraz Branch  
Shiraz, Iran  
MBVL57@gmail.com

**Abstract.** This study investigated the relationship between cultural intelligence and the use of expressions of gratitude among Iranian upper intermediate EFL learners. 50 upper intermediate learners were selected through purposive sampling, with their proficiency level being controlled. A discourse completion test (DCT) for the expressions of gratitude and a cultural intelligence scale were given to the participants of the study. Learners' DCT responses and cultural intelligence were rated on a five-point Likert scale and then analyzed. Statistical test including Pearson Correlation was used to test the hypothesis. The results of the analysis revealed that there was no significant relationship between cultural intelligence and the use of expressions of gratitude. Based on the results, it can be concluded that cultural intelligence, in general, and its level, in particular, may not have any influence on Iranian upper intermediate EFL Learners' use of expressions of gratitude,

---

Received: February 2017; Accepted: June 2017

\*Corresponding author

implying that at least in the case of acquiring expressions of gratitude, there seems to be no reason to capitalize much on learners' cultural intelligence.

**Keywords:** Cultural intelligence, expressions of gratitude, EFL learners

## 1. Introduction

Pragmatics is the study of meaning in relation to the context in which a person is speaking or writing. This includes social, situational and textual context. It also includes background knowledge context; that is, what people know about each other and about the world. The failure to convey or understand a pragmatic intention in another language and culture is what Thomas (1983) terms cross-cultural pragmatic failure. She describes two main types of cross-cultural pragmatic failure: sociopragmatic failure and pragmalinguistic failure. Pragmalinguistic failure is, essentially a linguistic problem, whereas sociopragmatic failure draws from the failure to understand different cultural perceptions and expectations of culture-specific speech act performance (Thomas, as cited in Paltridge, 2006). Syntax provides input to semantics and semantics provides input to pragmatics (Recanati, 2004). In contemporary linguistics, pragmatics is a quickly growing field and new discipline compared to other linguistic topics. Interlanguage pragmatics studies the interlanguage, which is related to the second language acquisition and pragmatics which is the study of language in context. Therefore, interlanguage pragmatics studies the second language acquisition in its context (Khorshidi & Nimchahi, 2013). As it is clear, learning a language cannot be separated from learning about the culture in which that language is spoken. The relationship between language and culture can be illustrated as shown in Figure 1 (Leech & Thomas, as cited in Khorshidi, 2013).

Language	Pragmatics	Culture
Pragmalinguistics (linguistic means of conveying illocutionary force and politeness)		Sociopragmatics (socially appropriate linguistic behavior)

**Figure 1.** The pragmatic continuum: Language culture

The benefit of this distinction is its pedagogical consequences. Teaching language in use requires both systems of knowledge: of the language and of the culture. But these are filtered through systems of beliefs—beliefs about language and beliefs about the world (Thomas, 1983). The process of globalization entails the acquisition of a construct, cultural intelligence (CQ), with which EFL students can function appropriately in intercultural situations. As a multidimensional concept, CQ consists of four dimensions: metacognitive, cognitive, motivational, and behavioral (Tajeddin & Momenian, 2011). Expressions of gratitude can be a happy experience for both the giver and the receiver. Expressing gratitude is a language function that has important social value in American English (Eisenstein & Bodman, 1986). Failure to express gratitude adequately can sometimes result in ruining the relationship of speaker and listener. Because of the high social value of the expression of gratitude, it is important for non-native speakers (NNSs) of English to express the function adequately (Cui, 2012).

## 2. Statement of the Problem

Pragmatics is simply meaning in interaction. Despite being a component of communicative competence, pragmatic competence has only recently become the focus of attention in SLA studies. The rationale for this recent attention is three-fold:

»» The emerging theoretical enthusiasm to explore a neglected component of communicative competence, particularly in view of its significance as one of the two principles of language competence (Bachman, as cited in Tajeddin, 2015).

»» New trends in interlanguage studies which view pragmatic competence as a field of study pertaining to interlanguage pragmatics (Tajeddin, 2015).

»» The necessity of providing students for the acquisition of pragmatics or speech acts (Tajeddin, 2015)

Because of the rapid growth of globalization, technology development, and population migrations, the need for communication with people

from other cultures was recognized in ELT in the 1980s, which then resulted in the intercultural perspective towards language teaching (Derin, Zeynep, Pinar & Ozlem, as cited in Tajeddin & Momenian, 2011). There was no focus on the ability to solve problems specifically in the cultural realm. For instance, considerable attention has been focused on social intelligence (Thorndike & Stein, 1937) targeted at interpersonal relations, emotional intelligence (Mayer & Salovey, 1993) targeted at understanding one's and others' emotions, and practical intelligence (Sternberg, as cited in Tajeddin & Momenian, 2011) targeted at solving practical problems. Yet, none of these different intelligences focus on the ability to solve cross-cultural problems. Hence, the present study is an attempt to fill the existing gap by investigating relationship between cultural intelligence and expressions of gratitude.

### **3. Significance of the Study**

Every language has cultural concepts and contextual norms for their use which reflect its native speakers' conceptions regarding the world. Many studies on cultural differences revealed that people with different cultures have different speaking styles. Generally, studies on cultures are divided into two kinds of cross-cultural and interlanguage pragmatic studies. Cross-cultural interaction is defined as the face-to-face interaction between people from different cultural backgrounds including empirical studies that investigates various speech acts (Wolfson, as cited in Yoosefvand & Eslami, 2014), whereas interlanguage pragmatics concentrates on the influence of pedagogical issues on pragmatic development (Ghobadi & Fahim, 2009). It is believed that learning a language is indeed learning how to communicate in that language, and a successful communication between interlocutors rests upon proper speech acts (Zhao & Throssel, 2011). Therefore, successful communication in a target language requires not only the knowledge of grammar and vocabulary but also pragmatic competence and knowledge about the culture of the target language. One important aspect of pragmatic competence is understanding and production of speech acts and their appropriateness in a given situation (Cheng, 2005).

Students with sufficient linguistic knowledge still make mistakes in real life communication with foreigners. These students are good at reading and writing with sufficient knowledge of English grammar and vocabulary, but they fail in communication with foreigners. In such cases, the mistakes they commit are not verbal or grammatical. Instead, these mistakes occur because certain social conventions or rules of interpersonal relationship have been violated (Lihuis & Jianbin, 2010). Culture deals with beliefs and values of a community. In fact, pragmatic competence is culture bound. ESL learners have the chance to acquire the knowledge of pragmatics since they are highly exposed to the target language, whereas EFL learners lack this opportunity. Therefore, not only should students be taught in this area of language, but also should teachers be instructed to be fully aware of how to teach this aspect of language. So this study is significant as it investigates the relationship between cultural intelligence and one aspect of students' pragmatic competence, namely, expressions of gratitude.

#### **4. Objective of the Study**

This study seeks to determine the relationship between cultural intelligence (intercultural competence) and expressions of gratitude among Iranian upper-intermediate EFL students.

Iranian learners of English may fail to use appropriate pattern of speech acts and may not know when it is appropriate to express certain feelings and to what degree such feelings should be conveyed on what occasion, especially in situations where negative feelings are involved, such as complaining. The reason for this is a number of differences between English and Persian in the area of speech acts which may be linked with different cultural values and beliefs. Different cultures may have different means and expressions for communicative intentions; thus, foreign language learners have to figure out what constitutes appropriate speech act behavior in terms of principles of politeness, use of native-like routines, and knowledge of the target social structure and values (Yoosefvand & Eslami-Rasekh, 2014).

## 5. Research Question & Hypothesis

### 5.1. Research question

RQ: Is there a relationship between cultural intelligence (intercultural competence) and the use of expressions of gratitude among Iranian upper-intermediate EFL students?

### 5.2. Null hypothesis

H0: There is no relationship between cultural intelligence and the use of expressions of gratitude among Iranian upper-intermediate EFL students.

## 6. Literature Review

### 6.1. Pragmatics

Pragmatic competence is the ability to use language appropriately in a social context which involves both innate and learned capacities and develops naturally through a socialization process (Takeuchi, Tesluk, Yun & Lepak, 2005). Knowledge of forms and strategies to convey particular illocutions is called pragmalinguistic competence, and knowledge of the use of these forms and strategies in an appropriate context is called sociopragmatic competence (Diploid, as cited in Mirzaei & Roohani, 2012). Pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics are two important aspects of communication for both learners and teachers. Both these aspects must be considered in learning or teaching a language (Trosborg, 1995). Any failure in L2 learners' comprehension and production of the idiosyncrasies of either component in any language use situation would lead to pragmatic failure or communication breakdown. Pragmalinguistic failure relates to a linguistic deficiency caused by differences in the linguistic encoding of pragmatic force, while sociopragmatic failure results from a lack of sociocultural knowledge and cross-culturally different perceptions of what constitutes appropriate linguistic behavior (Mirzaei & Roohani, 2012).

Crystal (1985) considered pragmatics as the study of the communicative action in its sociocultural context. Thus, it can be said that individuals have some sort of pragmatic competence which allows them to use

language in different and concrete situations, in various contexts. Therefore, pragmatic competence is mainly studied at the social level within limits of speech acts and social acts, interactions or at the interactional level. In order to understand better the development of pragmatic competence in language teaching, the competence types can be briefly analyzed as follows, based on various linguistics viewpoints (Ma, 2013):

Sociolinguistic competence is the ability to interpret the social meaning of a linguistic item and to decide and use language in appropriate social meaning for communicative purposes. Savignon (1983) stated that sociolinguistic competence is the knowledge of socio-cultural rules of discourse and language. It requires an understanding of the social context in which language is used e.g., the roles of participants, the information the share, and the function of interacting.

Interactional competence as Erton (2007) explains, is the competence which not only makes use of structural rules of language, but also runs the psycho-linguistic and socio-linguistic functions of language which help to provide accuracy and clarity to the mutual comprehension of the speech acts covered in the course of a conversation (Another name is functional competence).

Communicative competence is the ability to put language for communicative purposes. The communicative competence considers language as a tool used for communication. This competence focuses on the development of four language skills, and correlation between the skills (Widdison, 1978). Canale and Swain (1980) considered the term communicative competence as a mediator which refers to the relationship between grammatical competence (The knowledge of the rules of language) and the sociolinguistic competence (The knowledge of language use).

Strategic competence can be defined as an ability which deals with the knowledge of language and the ability to use this knowledge effectively and appropriately in order to take an active part in communicative interactions (Canale & Swain, 1980). A typical example for this case can be if you are late to a meeting and you need to find a good excuse, the white lie that you utter at that time is a product of your strategic competence (Erton, 2007).

Discourse competence is the ability to arrange sentences into cohesive

structures. In discourse analysis, the term discourse competence is studied within the limits of conversational interaction where language is considered a tool for successful communication. Such interactional patterns can be of great variety (Erton, 2007).

### **6.2. Interlanguage pragmatics**

Interlanguage pragmatics studies how non-native speakers understand and perform linguistic actions in a target language, and how they acquire L2 pragmatic knowledge (Kasper, 1996). It is relatively new research area that second language researchers noticed from the studies of pragmatics, but it attracts many researchers' interests for its significance in the pragmatics studies (Cai & Wang, 2013).

Recently SLA researchers pay more attention to interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) because L2 learners, even the high proficiency L2 learners usually make mistakes in their communication for their unawareness of pragmatic knowledge. Most studies of ILP focus on second language use, rather than second language learning (Kasper, 1992).

### **6.3. Discourse analysis**

Discourse is used to refer generally to "an instance of spoken or written language that has describable internal relationships of form and meaning (e.g., words, structures, cohesion) that relate coherently to an external communicative function or purpose and a given audience/interlocutor" (Celce-Murcia & Olshatain, 2000, p.4). Discourse analysis focuses on knowledge about language beyond the word, clause, phrase and sentence that is needed for successful communication. It looks at patterns of language across texts and considers the relationship between language and the social and cultural contexts in which it is used. Discourse analysis also considers the ways that the use of language presents different views of the world and different understandings (Paltridge, 2006).

### **6.4. Functions of language**

Function deals with the use of language or the way people use language. Jakobson (as cited in Poupary, 2012) says that the word function is a synonym of use. Functions are essentially the purposes that we accomplish with language, e.g., stating, requesting, responding, greet-



ing, parting, etc. Functions cannot be accomplished, of course, without the forms of language: morphemes, words, grammar rules, discourse rules. While forms are the outward manifestation of language, functions are the realization of those forms (Brown, 2014).

### **6.5. Expressions of gratitude**

Gratitude is a socially desirable virtue that is related to well-being at both personal and societal levels (Wang & Tudge, 2015). Persian and English native speakers give thanks and reply to thanks on numerous occasions in their everyday-life interactions with family members, friends, acquaintances and strangers. It is necessary to learn how to understand and produce language that is appropriate to the situations in which one is functioning, because failure to do so may cause misunderstandings and miscommunications. Being able to express one's gratitude and respond to expressions of gratitude appropriately in a wide variety of situations ranging from thanking someone for opening a door to expressing one's gratitude for a gift is something that most native speakers (NSs) take for granted. NSs can draw on the resources of their linguistic and socio-cultural knowledge to formulate their speech appropriately for a given context. This knowledge is referred to as pragmatic competence (Ahar & Eslami-Rasekh, 2011).

Hymes (as cited in Tajeddin & Momenian, 2011) compared British English and American English in the way they used 'thank you'. He pointed out that in American English 'thank you' is a formulaic and ritualized way of expressing gratitude, whereas in British English it is considered as a discourse marker. Okamoto and Robinson (1997), furthermore, found that 'thank you' is used in the British English when the interlocutor is of higher status. In an Iranian context, Farina and Suleiman (2009) did a pilot study and examined the speech act of gratitude among Iranian English as Foreign Language (EFL) learners through handling a written DCT to ten people and also examined whether EFL learners' L2 pragmatic competence was towards or away from the target language as the level of proficiency increases. The findings of this study suggested that language proficiency did not affect EFL learners' use of

strategies when expressing gratitude in the English language. Iranian and American respondents' used the same type of strategies in responding to the fourteen item questionnaires; however, they differed in the frequency of use of these strategies. American respondents resorted to fewer strategies in expressing gratitude in comparison with Iranian respondents.

### **6.6. Cultural intelligence**

Intelligence is a system of interacting abilities. These factors combine to define the ability of adapting to, and enacting a specific type of environment: one that is characterized by cultural diversity and cross cultural interactions. That is, cultural intelligence is a unique construct that emerges as a result of the interaction of its facets. Social and emotional intelligence share some attributes with cultural intelligence. The ability to understand oneself and others in a social situation and thus effectively interact with others so-called social intelligence (Kihlstrom & Cantor, 2000). Emotional intelligence, the ability to perceive the emotional states of others and to regulate one's own emotional state in the service of improved interactions (Goleman, 1995). However, both of these constructs are specific to the cultures in which they were developed and do not necessarily relate to cross cultural interactions. For example, social skills learned and respected in one country may be ineffective or even offensive in another culture with different rules for social interaction (Ruzgis & Grigorenko, as cited in Paltidge, 2006).

CQ pertains to how people adapt and thrive when they find themselves in an environment other than the one in which they were socialized (Brislin, Macnab & Worthy, 2006). In a business context, a culturally intelligent manager can make better decisions in cross-cultural contexts and can communicate and negotiate more effectively with foreign partners (Imai & Gelfand, 2010). CQ is a multidimensional construct with four dimensions: metacognitive, cognitive, motivational, and behavioral.

## **7. Methodology**

### **7.1. Participants**

At first, 75 Iranian MA EFL students majoring in English teaching

at Shiraz Azad University (20 male & 55 female) were selected based on purposive sampling. In order to determine the proficiency level of the students, Oxford Quick Placement Test was administrated. After administrating Oxford Quick Placement Test, a number of students were excluded. The results showed that 55 students out of 75 who took the test were at upper intermediate level. Also, five of them did not answer the questionnaires completely. At the final stage, participants of the study were reduced to 50 upper intermediate EFL leaners. This study therefore included 33 female and 17 male participants. The age of the participants ranged from 27 to 37 years with an average age of 32.

## 7.2. Instruments

Three different instruments were used in the present study:

1. A written discourse completion test (DCT related to Gratitude test)
2. The cultural intelligence scale, developed by cultural intelligence center in 2005
3. Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT)

The first instrument was adopted from Janani's study (1995) conducted on expressions of gratitude. The reliability of the DCT was reported by him to be .84.

This instrument consisted of 10 situations in which the students were asked to provide the best expressions of gratitude they thought were appropriate for that specific situation. In this study, the reliability of the DCT (Gratitude test) was calculated as .91, using Cronbach Alpha.

The second instrument was the cultural intelligence scale which consisted of 4 components:

- a) CQ-strategy included 4 items
- b) CQ-knowledge was comprised of 6 items
- c) CQ-motivation consisted of 5 items
- d) CQ-behavior was composed of 5 items

On the whole, this questionnaire included 20 items. Students were asked

to select the best description as they were based on five-point Likert scale. The reliability for this test was calculated as .93, using Cronbach Alpha. Oxford Quick Placement Test (2004) was another employed test which was produced by Oxford University. It is a quick way to test students' level of English. It is ideal for placing students in classes at the right level as well as for examination screening. There are two versions of the test. One is a computer-based which is adapted to test-takers level as they progress through the test. The other one is a paper and pencil version, which was used for the purpose of this study. The OQPT includes grammar, vocabulary and reading comprehension modules (Tajeddin & Momenian, 2011).

### 7.2.1. Reliability

#### 7.2.1.1. Reliability analysis of the cultural intelligence questionnaire and the gratitude test

The reliability of cultural intelligence test with 20 items turned out to be .93 and reliability of DCT (Gratitude test) with 10 items was calculated as .91. These results are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1:** Statistics for the cultural intelligence questionnaire and the gratitude test reliability

	Cronbach's	N of sample	N of Items
<b>Cultural intelligence Questionnaire</b>	<b>.932</b>	50	20
<b>Gratitude Test</b>	<b>.912</b>	50	10

#### 7.2.1.2. Inter-rater reliability

In order to ensure the reliability of the scoring procedure, two other raters were assigned the task of scoring the mentioned test and questionnaire. The results were then obtained and calculated, using Coppia Coefficient ( $r = .76$ ) to examine the consistency among the three raters (including this researcher).

### 7.3. Data collection procedures

At First, the Oxford Quick Placement test was administrated (version

1). The sheets were distributed among the students majoring in English teaching at Shiraz Azad University during the spring term of the year 2016. This test was administrated in order to determine their proficiency level. When every student's proficiency level in English was assessed through OQPT. Most of them were at upper intermediate level. Some of them were not homogeneous, therefore they were excluded. As mentioned earlier, this test which included vocabulary, grammar and reading comprehension questions. The students who answered 30 -47 tests correctly were placed at upper intermediate level of proficiency, according to scoring system of Oxford. The DCT (Appendix 1) and the cultural intelligence scale (Appendix 2) were distributed among the participants in another session. Due to manageability concerns these questionnaires distributed in one session.

#### 7.4. Data analysis procedures

A rubric was adapted (Ghobadi & Fahim , as cited in Tajeddin & Momenian , 2011) to rate the students' answers on the DCT based on five-point Likert scale, each defined as the following:

**Table 2:** A rubric taken by Ghobadi and Fahim (2009)

5	Excellent	Expressions are fully appropriate for the situation No or almost no grammatical and discourse errors recognized in the response Completely native- like full of creativity in producing responses
4	Good	Expressions are mostly appropriate for the situation Very few grammatical and discourse errors
3	Fair	Expressions are only somewhat appropriate Grammatical and discourse errors are noticeable, but they do not interfere with appropriateness and comprehensibility
2	Poor	Due to interference from grammatical and discourse errors appropriateness is difficult to determine
1	Very poor	Expressions are very difficult or too little to understand

The collected data were submitted to the SPSS software version 22 for statistical analysis. A Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used to determine if there was a relationship between cultural intelligence and the

use of expressions of gratitude.

### 7.5. Inferential analysis of the data

To determine if there was a relationship between cultural intelligence and the use of expressions of gratitude among Iranian EFL students, A Pearson Correlation coefficient was employed. The results of this analysis (*sig.* = 0.639,  $p > 0.05$ ) revealed that there was not any significant relationship between cultural intelligence and the use of expressions of gratitude ( Table 3).

**Table 3:** Correlation between cultural intelligence and expressions of gratitude

<b>Correlation</b>	
<b>Pearson Correlation</b>	-0.069
<b>Sig. (2-tailed)</b>	<b>.636</b>
<b>N</b>	50

## 8. Discussion

The findings of this study revealed that there was not any significant relationship between cultural intelligence and the use of expressions of gratitude among Iranian EFL students. Therefore the null hypothesis stating that there was no relationship between cultural intelligence and the use of expressions of gratitude among Iranian EFL students was retained and consequently research hypothesis was not supported. All of the participants in this study were at upper intermediate level of proficiency. This can be one of the reasons for the absence of a significant relationship between cultural intelligence and the use of expressions of gratitude among Iranian EFL students since they had already acquired the necessary background knowledge in order to use appropriate expressions of gratitude in English. This finding is in line with the study carried out by Tajeddin and Momenian's (2011) study on students at the intermediate level of proficiency. Jannai (1995) investigated the effect of levels of proficiency on expressions of gratitude among Persian EFL

learners. The results showed that the difference between the two levels of students was not meaningfully significant. Therefore it was concluded that students of all proficiency levels can perform this speech act appropriately and cultural intelligence does not have a very significant role to play. Of course, the role of instruction should not be ignored. The results of Jannai's study are in line with the findings of this article, therefore, cultural intelligence, may not have any influence on EFL Learners' use of expressions of gratitude. Another reason for the lack of a significant relationship between cultural intelligence and the use of expressions of gratitude probably stems from the fact that expressing gratitude is universal across languages (Brown & Levinson, 1987). As a result, neither native speakers nor learners of the target language expect to encounter different strategies in the thanking behavior in their interactions with each other. In this study, participants used different strategies of gratitude for each situation. Most of them used simple thanking at the beginning, middle or end of the sentence. Thanking was accompanied by appreciating the favor, asking God for rewarding the wishing, apologizing, and promising compensation for example:

- Thanks. God bless you
- Thanks, that's kind of you
- Thank you, tomorrow is my turn
- I will never forget your help
- Next time, I will compensate
- Sorry, I don't like to bother you. Thanks a lot.

The situations used in the discourse completion test in this study were all culturally familiar to the participants. Most of them used the similar strategies and expressions in locations. As a consequence, the difference in their CQ was not a determinant of their performance in producing expressions of gratitude. This, however, cannot be extended to the relationship between CQ and pragmatic competence in general because gratitude is only one manifestation of speech acts in English.

According to Ahar and. Eslami-Rasekh (2011), looking at the Amer-

ican common strategies for different situations, it became evident that they did not use any special strategy and they resorted to simple thanking as the dominant pattern (%70)

-Thank you very much

-Thank you so much

It can be concluded that different strategies selected by different participants in producing longer responses, full of compliments, apologizing and so on were originated from an Iranian culture. Knowledge of speech acts is an important factor in facilitating communication with speakers of English. When individuals want to communicate with other people from another culture they need not only to know when to start and terminate their speech but also to know how to make use of their words.

Emergence of intercultural competence in language teaching has led to a need to focus on a second language as a vehicle for communication in cultural contexts, and this in turn implies that an important goal for language learning is developing an understanding of appropriate communication in the target language. Consequently, language teaching now needs to be seen more in the context of intercultural communication, with the aim of preparing learners to communicate outside their own cultural boundaries. In such a perspective, pragmatic and discursive practices become an integral part of language learning from early on because they play a central role in intercultural communication, and mismatches between them have been identified as a key factor in communication breakdowns (Kasper & Rose, 2002).

## 9. Conclusion

Successful communication in a target language requires not only the knowledge of grammar and vocabulary but also pragmatic competence and knowledge about the culture of the target language. One important aspect of pragmatic competence is understanding and production of speech acts and their appropriateness in a given situation (Cheng, 2005). The results revealed that there was no significant relationship between cultural intelligence and the use of expressions of gratitude. The



results of the present study, however, suggest that cultural intelligence, in general, and its level, in particular, may not have any influence on Iranian upper intermediate EFL learners' use of expressions of gratitude, implying that at least in the case of acquiring expressions of gratitude, there seems to be no reason to capitalize much on learners' cultural intelligence.

### 10. Implications of the Study

The fact that communication problems exist even after students have received years of instruction on vocabulary and grammar is definitely a cause of concern. Students make mistakes in their communication for their unawareness of pragmatic knowledge. Pragmatic competence refers to the ability to comprehend, construct and convey meanings that are both accurate and appropriate for the social and cultural circumstances in which communication occurs. In simple terms, Pragmatic competence is about culture, communication, and in the case of second languages about intercultural communication. In order for second language learners to acquire pragmatic competence they need to acquire cultural understanding and communication skills. Most of the problems that EFL learners face in intercultural communication are mainly pragmatics. Teachers of EFL often choose not to stress pragmatic knowledge in their classrooms, focusing instead on linguistic knowledge. Therefore, pragmatic instruction should be one of the core components of EFL teacher training programs (Ma, 2013). To conclude, this study can inform theoreticians and practitioners regarding the relationship between cultural intelligence and one aspect of students' pragmatic competence, namely, expressions of gratitude.

## References

- Ahar, V., & Eslami-Rasekh, A. (2011). The effect of social status and size of imposition on the gratitude strategies of Persian and English speakers. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(1), 120-128.

Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., & Koh, C. (2006). Personality correlates of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence. *Group & Organization Management, 31*(1), 100-123.

Brown, S., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brislin, R., Worthley, R., & Macnab, B. (2006). Cultural intelligence understanding behaviors that serve people's goals. *Group and Organization Management, 31*(1), 40-55.

Brown, D. (2014). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. NY: Pearson Education.

Cai, L., & Wang, Y. (2013). Interlanguage pragmatics in SLA. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 3*(1), 142-147. doi:10.4304/tpls.3.1.142-147

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second Language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(1), 1-47.

Cheng, S. W. (2005). *An exploratory cross-sectional study of interlanguage pragmatic development of expressions of gratitude by Chinese learners of English*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, The University of Iowa.

Cohen, A. (1996). Developing the ability to perform speech acts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18*(2), 94-289.

Crystal, D. (1985). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Cui, X. (2012). A cross-linguistic study on expressions of gratitude by native and non-native English speakers. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 3*(4), 753-760.

Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*(1), 109-132.

Eisentein, M., & Bodman, J. (1986). I very appreciate: Expressions of gratitude by native and non-native speakers of American English. *Applied Linguistics, 17*, 411-432.

Erton, I. (2007). Applied pragmatics and competence relations in language learning and teaching. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 3*(1), 201-218.

- Farnia, M., & Suleiman, R. (2009). An interlanguage pragmatic study of expressions of gratitude by Iranian EFL learners-A pilot study. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, 5, 108-140.
- Ghobadi, A., & Fahim, M. (2009). The effect of explicit and implicit teaching of English 'thanking formulas' on Iranian EFL intermediate level students at English language institutes. *System*, 37, 526-537.
- Goffman, E. (1976). *Interaction ritual: Essays in face-to-face behavior*. Chicago: Aldine Publishers.
- Golman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Imai, L., & Gelfand, M. (2010). The culturally intelligent negotiator: The impact of cultural intelligence on negotiation sequences and outcomes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.201002.001
- Izumi, S. (2002). Output-input enhancement and the noticing hypothesis: An experimental study on ESL relativization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24, 541-577.
- Janani, M. (1995). *Pragmatic failure of Iranian language learners in expressing gratitude*. Unpublished MA thesis Tarbiat Modarres University, Tehran, Iran.
- Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatics transfer. *Second Language Research*, 8(3), 203-231.
- Kasper, G., & Schmidt, R. (1996). Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18(2), 149-169.
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). Pragmatic development in a second language. *Language Learning*, 52, 231-255.
- Khorshidi, H. R., & Nimchahi, A. B. (2013). Motivation and interlanguage pragmatics in Iranian English language learners. *English Language Teaching*, 6(6), 86-92.
- Khorshidi, A. S. (2013). Negative interlanguage pragmatic transfer and motivation integrative and instrumental in Iranian English language learners. *The Iranian EFL Journal*, 28, 468-480. Kihlstrom,
- Kihlstrom, J. F., & Cantor, N. (2000). *Social intelligence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Lihuis, Z., & Jianbin, H. (2010). A study of Chinese EFL learners' pragmatic failure implications for college English teaching. *Polyglossia*, 18, 41-54.
- Lyons, J. (1990). *Language and linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey. (1993). The intelligence of emotional intelligence. *Intelligence*, 17, 433-442.  
doi: 10.1016/0160-2896(93)90010-3
- Ma, N. D. (2013). The role of pragmatics in English language teaching: Pragmatic competence. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 2(4), 63-70.
- Mirzaei, A., & Roohani, A. (2012). Exploring pragmalinguistic and socio-pragmatic variability in speech act production of L2 learners and native speakers. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 4(3), 79-102.
- Norouzian, R., & Eslami, Z. (2016). Critical perspectives on interlanguage pragmatics development: An agenda for research. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 20(2), 25-50.
- Okamoto, S., & Robinson, W. P. (1997). Determinants of gratitude expressions in England. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 16(4), 411-433.
- Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse analysis*. London: MPG Books.
- Recanati, F. (2004). *Literal meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rezvani, A., & Özdemir, C. (2010). Interlanguage pragmatics in action: Use of expressions of gratitude. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 3, 194-202.
- Savington, S. J. (1983). *Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice*. Ma: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Tajeddin, Z., & Momenian, M. (2011). The interface between cultural intelligence and interlanguage pragmatics: The case of gratitude speech act. *Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 4(1), 169-192.
- Tajeddin, Z. (2015). *Interlanguage pragmatics and language teaching*. Tehran: Jungle.

Takeuchi, R., Tesluk, P. E., Yun, S., & Lepak, D. P. (2005). An integrative view of international experiences. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 85-100.

Thorndike, R. L., & Stein, S. (1937). An evaluation of the attempts to measure social intelligence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 34(5), 275.

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

Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage pragmatics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Widdoson, H. G. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: Oxford Press.

Wang, D., Wang, y., & Tudge, R. H. (2015). Expressions of gratitude in children and adolescents: Insights from china and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 46(8), 1039-1058.

Yarmohammadi, L., & Rashidi, N. (2013). *Practical contrastive analysis of English and Persian with special emphasis on discourse*. Tehran: Rahnama.

Yoosefvand, A., & Eslami-Rasekh, A. (2014). A comparative study of gratitude speech act between Persian and English speakers. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 1(2), 44-61.

Zhao, Y., & Throssel, P. (2011). Speech act theory and its application to EFL teaching in China. *The International Journal of Language, Society and Culture*, 32, 88-95.

### Appendix 1: DCT (Gratitude Test) Taken by Janani (1995)

**Directions:** Read each of the following scenarios. In the space provided, write what you would say in the situation in a normal conversation.

1. You have put on a new sweater. You run into your fellow student on the street. She says, "What a pretty sweater you have!"

How would you respond?.....

2. You've got an 'A' grade on your exam. Your teacher says, "Congratulations, you did a good job!"

How would you respond? .....

3. You are in sudden need of money for your next term tuition. Your friend notices this and offers to lend it to you.

What would you say to thank her for that?.....

4. You are a student. Your teacher gives a lecture. The time is over and he is finished. You want to leave.

What would you say to thank her for the lecture? .....

5. You are in a restaurant with your friend. You have a wonderful meal. Your friend says, "I'll pay."

What would be your response? .....

6. You are invited to a party. You have a new haircut. Your friend says, "You look wonderful with your new haircut!"

What would be your response? .....

7. You go to your teacher's office to find out about your score on the exam. Your teacher says, "Congratulations! You've got an 'A'."

How would you respond? .....

8. You are short of money for half of your tuition. Your friend finds out and says, "what if I pay you the other half and you pay me back later on."

How would you thank her for it? .....

9. The school bell goes. Your teacher says, "Ok. Class dismissed."

As you leave the class, how would you thank her? .....

10. You and your friend go to a Japanese restaurant and have a good meal. Your friend pays for it.

What would you say to thank her for that?.....

**Appendix 2:** Cultural Intelligence Questionnaire (Cultural Intelligence Center, 2005) .The 20-item, Four-Factor Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS)

Select the answer that BEST describes you AS YOU REALLY ARE (1=strongly disagree; 5=strongly agree).

**CQ Questionnaire Items factor**

**CQ-Strategy:**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1 | I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I use when interacting with people with different cultural backgrounds. |
| 2 | I adjust my cultural knowledge as I interact with people from a culture that is unfamiliar to me.                |
| 3 | I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I apply to cross-cultural interactions.                                 |
| 4 | I check the accuracy of my cultural knowledge as I interact with people from different cultures.                 |

**CQ-Knowledge:**

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 5  | I know the legal and economic systems of other cultures.                |
| 6  | I know the rules (e.g., vocabulary, grammar) of other languages.        |
| 7  | I know the cultural values and religious beliefs of other cultures.     |
| 8  | I know the marriage systems of other cultures.                          |
| 9  | I know the arts and crafts of other cultures.                           |
| 10 | I know the rules for expressing non-verbal behaviors in other cultures. |

**CQ-Motivation:**

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 11 | I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures.                                    |
| 12 | I am confident that I can socialize with locals in a culture that is unfamiliar to me.      |
| 13 | I am sure I can deal with the stresses of adjusting to a culture that is new to me.         |
| 14 | I enjoy living in cultures that are unfamiliar to me.                                       |
| 15 | I am confident that I can get accustomed to the shopping conditions in a different culture. |

**CQ-Behavior:**

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 16 | I change my verbal behavior (e.g., accent, tone) when a cross-cultural interaction requires it. |
| 17 | I use pause and silence differently to suit different cross-cultural situations.                |
| 18 | I vary the rate of my speaking when a cross-cultural situation requires it.                     |
| 19 | I change my non-verbal behavior when a cross-cultural interaction requires it.                  |
| 20 | I alter my facial expressions when a cross-cultural interaction requires it.                    |

	Strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	Strongly agree
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					