

Effects of Instructional Intervention in Low-Level College Students' Learning of Request Acts*

Eun-Mi Yang

(Kkottongnae Hyundo University of Social Welfare)

Yang, Eun-Mi. (2006). Effects of instructional intervention in low-level college students' learning of request acts. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 12(2), 215-235.

This paper explores the effects of two different methods of instruction for 106 low-level Korean learners of English at a college in learning request expressions. Both of the methods contained the focus-on-form and function characteristics, while the degree of explicitness for input enhancement was differentiated. Abundant email samples written by English native speakers for the input were provided and email writing practice for the output was proceeded for both groups of the students in the treatment sessions. The numbers of target forms used in pretest and posttest results were compared quantitatively: The tests included email writing and open-ended Discourse Completion Test (DCT). The results indicated that the target pragmatic features were slightly better learned under the condition of relatively high degree of explicit instruction with metapragmatic information, even though the difference was statistically insignificant. In addition, the students' use of request strategies both in email and DCT was affected positively by the treatment with email input and output. That is, the students applied the request strategies they learned through email into their oral production (open-ended DCT) as well as their email writing. Further study on the output effect of target features in advancing pragmatic competence is suggested.

[English teaching/request/pragmatic competence/email English/speech act]

I. INTRODUCTION

Korean English speakers' pragmatic ability in performing various speech acts has

* Earlier version of this paper was presented at the annual conference of the Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics at Edinburgh University in G.B. in 2005.

been investigated widely and their deviant or limited pragmatic ability regardless of their overall English level has been reported in many studies (e.g., Jeon, 1996; Moon, 1996; Park & Nakano, 1999; Paik, 1998; Suh, 1998; Yang, 2000, 2001a, 2001b). Pragmatic ability is the competence of taking appropriate communicative action in its sociocultural context. The major part of communicative action includes using speech acts, such as apologizing, complaining, complimenting, and requesting. In the area of request act, Korean English speakers' use of conventionally indirect routines and politeness devices was found to be very restricted (Yang, 2000, 2001a, 2001b). It was speculated that the major reason for this lack of pragmatic ability of Korean English speakers was due to the poor pragmatic input, which is the common phenomena in many foreign language situations. In fact, it was found that some common routine formulas and downgraders for polite request acts did not appear at all or only a few were presented in high school English textbooks in Korea according to recent studies (Yang, 2004, 2005). For example, the commonly used conventionally indirect request strategies such as '*Would it be possible...?*' or '*Would it be all right...?*' were rarely presented, and '*I wonder if you could...*' was presented in a small number of textbooks in those studies.

Bialystok (1993) asserts that pragmatic competence will increase only if there is sufficient input of the target feature, if this input is noticed, and if learners can analyze it sufficiently and develop control. Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (1993), Kasper (1996), and Schmidt (1995) also argue for an input-based explanation for the differential effect of the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and English as a Second Language (ESL) situation. Most of the classrooms in an EFL setting do not seem to emphasize pragmatic appropriateness a lot unlike the grammatical accuracy. Accordingly, EFL students identified and ranked grammatical errors as more serious than pragmatic errors, while ESL learners and their teachers showed the opposite pattern, ranking pragmatic errors as more serious than grammatical errors (Bardovi-Harlig & Dornyei, 1998). Bardovi-Harlig and Dornyei argues that learners in an ESL context are more likely to pay close attention to the pragmatic aspects of input and to struggle to understand to establish relationships with target language speakers than learners in an EFL context.

In this regard, it is of great necessity for educators and researchers to present proper variety of pragmatic conventions in English syllabi and inquire into the effective instructional methods in pragmatics in EFL contexts to help learners aware of pragmatically appropriate linguistic behavior to behave in a globalised world. In spite of the importance of pragmatic aspects in teaching agenda, the number of studies on

instructional effectiveness is relatively small in Korea, comparing to the amount of research on pragmatic features of Korean learners' interlanguage. Under this circumstance, the ultimate goal of this study is to contribute to the field in developing a better informed pragmatic instructional model by providing concrete examples with an experimental study. Thus, this study examines the efficacy of two different instructional methods based on mainstream SLA theories.

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

1. The Input Factor

Examining the differences of speech act realization in cross-cultural language features and interlanguage features was the main focus in pragmatic research in the past. Much research has gone into identifying how native speakers and non-native speakers realize speech acts and evidenced that non-native speakers choose different speech acts or strategies from native speakers regardless of their level of proficiency (e.g., Bardov-Harlig & Hartford, 1993; Cohen & Olshtain, 1993; House, 1996; Jeon, 1996; Moon, 1996; Park & Nakano, 1999; Paik, 1998; Suh, 1998; Yang, 2000, 2001a, 2001b). From those studies a common implication was acquired: the availability of input and influence of instruction are two of the most influential factors for pragmatic differences between native speakers and learners among others. The input factor has been investigated by a series of comparisons of textbook presentation and authentic language use (e.g., Boxer & Pickering, 1995; Yang, 2004, 2005). The surveys by Yang (2004, 2005) examined the presentation of request acts in contemporary high school English textbooks in Korea and found that they generally demonstrate a second reflection of the native speakers' use of request strategies. Most of them were found to include only casual forms of routine formulas not presenting a variety of elaborated polite routine formulas that native speakers frequently use, which is partly due to the lack of diversity in interlocutors' social relationships presented in the textbooks. They suggested that situationally appropriate and a variety of input data be presented in teaching materials and effective instructional models be developed for students' pragmatic competence.

2. The Instructional Factor

In addition to the input availability, the benefit of instruction was emphasized as being critical in acquiring many aspects of L2 pragmatics (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001). Even though data-based research on the effect of pragmatic instruction in a classroom setting is scarce, studies in this area prove the benefit of instruction in developing pragmatic competence. In her study, House (1996) reported that learner-centered pair work and role-plays greatly increased the students' range of speech acts and discourse functions. Pragmatic fluency of German EFL subjects in the use of conversational routines was improved by teaching metapragmatic awareness in House's study by the instrument of role-play. Billmyer (1990) investigated the instructional effectiveness on teaching complimenting and responding to compliments for ESL students and found an evidence of its positive effects.

Very few studies have been conducted on the effect of instructional intervention in pragmatic aspects in Korean EFL context. Kim, Dae-Jin (1998) used an interactive book reading method with role playing for developing pragmatic competence of children in EFL context. He concluded that this method of teaching with role plays has a promising potential to teaching situation-specific pragmatic competence of children. Kim, Hye-Ryun (1998) studied the effect of metapragmatic information in a college English class by Discourse Completion Test (DCT) in several speech act situations—apology, request, refusal, and gratitude—comparing its result with a control group's. Her findings on the effect of metapragmatic instruction show that the experimental group who got explicit instruction outperformed the control group who did not get explicit instruction. The effectiveness of explicit instruction was evidenced in Han Jong-im's (1999) study on teaching request strategies and internal modifications as well. The students were instructed explicitly about a proper choice of request strategies and internal modifications and they produced better strategies in their posttest questionnaire results in her study.

The instructional intervention and effects on pragmatic development has been noticeably shifted toward involving SLA theory and research these days (Kasper, 2001). Three SLA hypotheses are prevalent in leading the current state of developing an instructional model in pragmatics areas. They are noticing hypothesis (Schmidt, 1993, 1995), output hypothesis (Swain, 1996, 1998) and interaction hypothesis (Long, 1996). The noticing hypothesis holds that in order for input to be turned into intake, it needs to be registered under awareness. Swain (1996) argues for the advantages of productive language use in his output hypothesis: Output makes it possible for

learners to notice gaps between their interlanguage and the target language. In other words, when learners experience communication difficulties, they will be “pushed” into making their output more precise, coherent, and appropriate, thus contributing to language learning. Interaction hypothesis (Long, 1996) proposes that negotiation of meaning with a more competent interlocutor facilitates acquisition. Input enhancement for learners’ consciousness raising (Sharwood Smith, 1993) and form-focused instruction are basically based on the above-mentioned hypotheses. Some studies illustrate that it is rather a focus on form and function in pragmatic teaching than a focus on form only which is applicable to grammar teaching because of the nature of the pragmatics teaching (Kasper, 2001), that is, “pragmalinguistic knowledge requires mappings of form, meaning, force, and context” (p. 51).

Several studies (e.g., House, 1996; Takahashi, 2001; Tateyama, 2001) presented the findings which prove an advantage for explicit metapragmatic teaching with the prevailing SLA theoretical background, such as noticing hypothesis, output hypothesis, and interaction hypothesis. Among them, Takahashi’s (2001) study is noticeable, which compared the effects of three different degrees and types of input-enhancement instruction with a meaning-focused condition in teaching request strategies, and found that explicit group learned target forms more successfully. She points out that simple noticing and attention to target pragmatic features as in implicit teaching does not lead to learning.

III. RESEARCH METHOD

1. Research Questions

The purpose of this research is to explore and compare the effectiveness of the different instructional methods according to its degree of explicitness to enhance the learners’ acquisition in a pragmatic area, especially in teaching a communicative act of request. This research should lead to developing an effective instructional model which can provide sufficient pragmalinguistic resources for learners in Korean situation by assessing the effectiveness of the two different ways of focus-on-form and function instruction.

The following research questions were addressed:

(1) Do the deductive and inductive instructional methods influence learners’ production differently: Do learners show the different degrees of acquisition after they

get instruction in different ways?

(2) Do the oral production (open-ended DCT) and email data of the two groups show different result in using target forms after the treatment since the instruction includes email reading and writing practice only without oral practice in class: Do the students apply the request strategies they learned through email into their oral production (open-ended DCT) as well as their email writing?

2. Participants

The participants were 106 Korean college students, the majority of whom were female in four different classes taught by the researcher. They were mostly sophomores with social welfare majors. They had received formal classroom instruction in English for about 6 years before they entered the university and 1 year in their freshman year at the university. The four classes of the subjects were split into two groups (59 and 47 students respectively) with 2 classes in each group. Their overall English level was assumed as high beginning according to the result of a simulated TOEIC test. Their TOEIC scores were mostly around 400, and the results of t-test performed on the TOEIC raw scores indicated that there was no significant difference in English proficiency between the two groups ($t\text{-value}=0.81$, $p=0.42$). Some of the subjects were excluded when they submitted only pretest or posttest or when they submitted the same copies of the pretest and posttest. Accordingly, the analysis was carried out with data from 79 students: 42 for one group and 37 for another group.

3. Design

An experiment was conducted on two separate groups (two classes in each group) and pretest/posttest design was adopted. For pretest/posttest, email writing and Discourse Completion Test (DCT) were employed to elicit the main data before and after the treatment sessions. DCT, developed by Blum-Kulka (1982) to elicit oral production, has been used in many interlanguage pragmatics studies because of its proven advantages of controlling variables and eliciting a great deal of data. But its disadvantage is that the data from subjects can be somewhat unnatural because it uses a written mode to elicit spoken data.

The ways of performing request acts in target situations were taught for two different groups using different treatments including email reading and writing

practice. The critical difference between the two different treatments is on the degree of intervention in “focus-on-form and function treatments”. For one group, “focus-on-form and function” was achieved through a deductive process with explicit and metalinguistic explanation of the target forms and functions with provided example data, while it was achieved through an inductive discovery process of the target forms and functions in given input data for the other group.

The pretest/posttest results in DCT and email for each target situation were analyzed quantitatively: The number of students who provided the target request forms was compared between groups and between assessment means (DCT and email). The significance of the difference in frequency counts was determined through chi-square analysis.

4. Target Request Situations and Strategies

Two basic situations (adopted from Yang (2001, 2002)) were selected as the target situations to be taught in treatment sessions. In one situation a request is made to a higher-status hearer (between a student and a professor); in another situation a request is made to a same-status hearer (between friends). Therefore, the interlocutors in Situation 1 have negative social distance (they know each other) and a hearer’s social power is higher than a speaker: Social factors are described as –SD (negative social distance) and S<H (speaker<hearer). On the other hand, the social factors in Situation 2 are described as –SD and S=H. The target request situations adopted from Yang (2001, 2002) are described as follows:

Situation 1 (-SD, S<H): You are a student and are preparing for a job. You want to apply for a company, so you need a recommendation letter. You decided to email one of your professor, to ask him/her for a recommendation letter. You had a course taught by him/her last semester. Please write an email message requesting the letter below.

Situation 2 (-SD, S=H): You are working at a company. You have a close friend, who is a graduate student in Korea. You want to ask her/him to get a video tape which was produced in Korea for reference for your company. The title of the tape is “A Beautiful Earth”. It is not available in the market in your country yet. Please write an e-mail message asking for a favor.

The target request strategies were selected from the 70 emails written by English native speakers (ENSs) for Situation 1 and Situation 2 based on the frequencies of the strategies used by ENSs as in Table 1. The 70 email data are from Yang's (2001, 2002) previous research which was designed partly to investigate the actual use of request strategies in email by ENSs. Four kinds of target strategies were selected for Situation 1 and they are those which were found in more than three emails by ENSs. It was found that the kinds of strategies used for Situation 1 by the ENSs were not that varied, while more varied strategies were employed for Situation 2. As a result, nine different kinds of strategies for Situation 2 which were used by more than 3 ENSs were chosen. The given nine target forms seemed a lot for the students to acquire just over 2 treatment sessions comparing to the four target forms for Situation 1. But they were all included as the target forms considering the importance of letting the students be exposed to authentic language. The selected 20 example emails out of 70 written by ENSs in Yang (2001, 2002), which contained target request strategies, were provided to the students in treatment sessions. Therefore, the goal of the instruction was set to make the students focus on and be aware of the target authentic request forms and eventually use them in their discourse.

TABLE 1
Target Request Strategies

Situation	Target request strategies
Situation 1	<i>I would appreciate it/be grateful, if...</i> <i>I wonder/was wondering if you...</i> <i>Would it be possible/Is it possible for you to...?</i> <i>Would you mind...?</i>
Situation 2	<i>I would appreciate it/be grateful, if...</i> <i>I wonder/was wondering if you...</i> <i>Would it be possible/Is it possible for you to...?</i> <i>Would you mind...?</i> <i>Would/Could you...?</i> <i>Can/Will you...?, Can/May I...?</i> <i>Please.../directive</i> <i>I want/hope/would like ...</i> <i>Do you think you could...?</i>

5. Pretest and Posttest

The pretest and posttest were conducted in the first week of the semester in March, and in the 14th week of the semester around the end of May in 2005 respectively. The pretest effect was eliminated since the treatment session was offered in the 6th, 7th, and

8th week and posttest was in the 14th week. The pretest/posttest involved DCT as well as email writing, even though the instruction did not include oral practice for using request strategies: it was proceeded with reading the provided email examples written by English native speakers (ENSs) and writing email according to given situations. This was to investigate if the instructional effectiveness of email writing exists on the development of not only email writing but also oral communication skills when we consider the DCT a tool for assessing the oral communication skill. The DCT and email writing contained 2 different situations respectively. The 2 situations for DCT have corresponding social factors with the given 2 situations for email writing: Situation 1s for email and DCT are for making a request from a student to a professor and situation 2s for email and DCT involve making a request between friends. The subjects were asked to read the description of situations and write down what they would be most likely to write (email) or say (DCT) in the given situations. DCT was filled in by the students in class, while email was written at home as homework.

The following situations, which have conformal social factors with the given situations in treatment sessions, were provided for pretest and posttest of email writing and DCT:

Situation 1 for email (-SD, S<H): This is the end of the semester and you want to have a meeting with your academic advisor (Prof. Gildong Hong) to talk about the courses you are taking next semester. You are to write email to him/her to make an appointment to visit him/her. It is convenient for you to meet him within this week. How would you write email to the professor?

Situation 2 for email (-SD, S=H): One of your close friends, Hyunjin Kim, has been studying English in New York University since six months ago. You became to study English at the same university from this coming semester. You will arrive at New York on August 20, and you want Hyunjin to pick you up at the airport to ride you to the school dormitory. How would you write email to your friend?

Situation 1 for DCT (-SD, S<H): Tomorrow is the due date of a final term paper for one of the courses you take this semester. However, for some reason you are not able to submit it on time. You want to talk to the professor, whom you have known for a couple of years, and ask him/her to give you an extension on the paper. You visit his/her office. What would you say?

Situation 2 for DCT (-SD, S=H): You are taking a course. Since you had a bad cold, you missed a few classes last week. A mid-term exam is scheduled to be held next week. You know that one of the classmates attends classes regularly and takes good notes. You want to borrow his/her notebook. You approach him/her. What would you say?

IV. TREATMENT PROCEDURES

The goal of the instruction was set for the students to develop the ability to employ appropriate request strategies which suit for each different situation through the instruction. The students received instruction on request acts over 3 weeks consecutively (70 minutes per week during the 6th, 7th, and 8th week among 16 weeks of the semester period) in a general English class. The methods for focus-on-form and function were used in two different ways for 2 different groups. The instruction was basically based on the two prevailing hypotheses: Noticing and output hypothesis. While the two different forms of the instructional intervention were used, both of them had the explicit nature with different degrees in noticing target forms.

For group 1 (deductive teaching group with metapragmatic information), first, handouts with detailed explanation on the target forms and diverse email samples by native speakers in Situation 1 were provided. The target request forms were explained using the handouts and then students practiced the way to use target forms with email writing exercises. After finishing writing, several students read aloud their email to the class (Session 1 and 2). They went through the same procedure for Situation 2 (Session 2 and 3).

Group 2 students (inductive teaching group with form-comparison), first, wrote email for Situation 1. Following this, they read various email samples by ENSs in the same situation. After that, the students were required to notice the gap between ENS request forms and their own corresponding L2 forms in email. They talked in pairs on what they had discovered about the differences of the email by ENSs and themselves (Session 1 and 2). They went through the same procedure for Situation 2 (Session 2 and 3).

Email writing practice in an English classroom was chosen as a means for teaching request strategies for three major reasons. First, it was adopted due to the greatly increasing possibility of using this skill outside the classroom. Second, since email

writing usually involves a speech act as a communication mode, it was considered a good means to teach speech acts. It was presumed that the pragmalinguistic knowledge learned through email writing might allow the students to apply it into their oral communication as well. The study on the potential of using email to improve oral language proficiency had found its positive effect in Kim, Jeong-ryeol (2003). Finally, the inclusion of email is related to the characteristics of its written communication mode. People can plan the writing in advance, and it requires careful planning and revising procedure before sending the mail. The feature of requiring careful selection of organizational patterns, requesting strategies, or downgraders can be a very effective means to develop learners' sensitivity and awareness on various language aspects, such as linguistic, sociocultural, pragmatic, and rhetorical aspects. Accordingly, students' output of target features through writing was expected to increase the chances of their noticing the features as Swain (1996, 1998) claims.

V. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The numbers of the students who employed the target forms or non-target forms were compared for each situation in email writing and DCT respectively. The significance of the difference in frequency counts was determined through chi-square analysis. The difference was assessed between the results of email writing and DCT in the pretest since the situations had different contents, but the difference was found not significant ($\chi^2=0.37$, $df=1$, $p<1$ in deductive teaching group; $\chi^2=1.12$, $df=1$, $p<1$ in inductive teaching group). This means the students used very small number of the target forms both in email and DCT; they used mostly non-target forms both in email and DCT of the pretest.

1. Focus-on-Form and Function Effect in Situation 1

In Situation 1 where a request is made to a professor from a student, four different kinds of target request strategies were provided for the instruction according to the ENSs' email data in the same situation. The students were exposed to those request strategies in class and encouraged to use them in their production by email writing in the treatment sessions. After the treatment, students' use of request strategies in Situation 1 was tested through an email writing test and a DCT.

1) Email in Situation 1

In Situation 1 the most favored request strategies in the students' email before the treatment were '*I want...*', '*I hope...*', and '*I would like...*': they were employed by 48% of the deductive teaching group (hereafter, DT) students and 53% of the inductive teaching group (hereafter, IT) students as shown in Table 2. Example requesting sentences using these request strategies are as follows: "*I hope meeting you within this week*", "*I want to see you within this week*", and "*I'd like to meet you this week.*"

The next most favored forms in the pretest were mood derivables with '*Please*', which was used by 24% of the DT students and 14% of the IT students, and '*Would you...?*' or '*Could you...?*', which were used by 17% of the DT students and 14% of the IT students). After the treatment, while many of the students (21% of DT and 25% of IT) still preferred the non-target forms of '*I want...*', '*I hope...*', or '*I would like...*', we can see that more than half of those who used them in the pretest abandoned these forms and chose target forms in the posttest.

TABLE 2
Request Strategies in Email for Situation 1 (number(%))

Strategy type		Email			
		Deductive Teaching Group (DT)		Inductive Teaching Group (IT)	
		Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest
Target forms	<i>I would appreciate it/be grateful, if...</i>	0(0%)	4(10%)	0(0%)	2(6%)
	<i>I wonder/was wondering...</i>	0(0%)	9(21%)	1(3%)	7(18%)
	<i>Would it be/Is it possible...?</i>	1(2%)	1(2%)	0(0%)	1(3%)
	<i>Would you mind...?</i>	0(0%)	3(7%)	2(6%)	2(6%)
Target forms total		1(2%)	17(40%)	3(8%)	12(33%)
Non-target forms	<i>Do you think you could...?</i>	0(0%)	1(2%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
	<i>Would/Could you/I...?</i>	7(17%)	5(12%)	5(14%)	5(14%)
	<i>Can/Will you/I...?, may I...?</i>	3(7%)	4(10%)	3(8%)	2(6%)
	<i>Please..., directive</i>	10(24%)	3(7%)	5(14%)	4(11%)
	<i>I want..., I hope..., I would like...</i>	20(48%)	9(21%)	19(53%)	9(25%)
	Others	1(2%)	4(10%)	1(3%)	4(11%)
Non-target forms total		41(98%)	25(60%)	33(92%)	24(67%)
Total		42(100%)	42(100%)	36(100%)	36(100%)

As displayed in Table 2, only 2% of DT students and 8% of IT students used target forms on the pretest. However, in the posttest results, it was found that the number of students who used target forms increased a lot from 2% to 40% in the email of the DT

students and from 8% to 33% in the IT students. The differences in numbers on between the pretest and the posttest were statistically significant for both the DT and the IT in email ($\chi^2=18.10$, $df=1$, $p<.001$ for the DT email; $\chi^2=6.83$, $df=1$, $p<.01$ for the IT email). Slightly more target forms were used by DT students (40%) than IT students (33%), but the difference is not statistically significant ($\chi^2=0.42$, $df=1$, $p<.6$ between the DT and IT email).

The target forms, such as *'I wonder/I was wondering...'*, *'Would you mind...'*, *'Is it/Would it be possible...'*, and *'I would appreciate it...'* are frequently used request strategies by English native speakers, but they were not presented in many of the high school English textbooks in Korea according to previous research (Yang, 2004, 2005). As a result, the great majority of the students are not supposed to have been exposed to these strategies, and their limited use of these strategies on the pretest represents the reality. However, the result of the posttest is very encouraging. Closer examination of the realization patterns for the target forms on the posttest revealed that the students who provided the target forms tended predominantly to use the *'I wonder/I was wondering...'* form (21% by DT and 18% by IT students). A possible explanation for this could be that the input frequency of *'I wonder/I was wondering...'* surpassed the other target forms, and accordingly, these forms were noticed more in the treatment sessions. Many students who could not supply the target forms still relied on the use of either *'Would you/Could you...'* (both by DT and IT students) or mood derivables with *'Please...'* (by IT students).

2) Discourse Completion Test in Situation 1

Very few target forms were found on the pretest of DCT (5% and 3% respectively by the DT students and the IT students) as shown in Table 3. Before the treatment, the most frequently used strategy by the students was mood derivables with *'please'* (44% by DT and 46% by IT), and the second most frequently used strategies were *'Would you...?'* or *'Could you...?'*: they were used by 22% of the DT students and 19% of the IT students. Interestingly, *'I want...'*, *'I hope...'*, or *'I would like...'*, which were used most frequently in email, were not found a lot on the DCT pretest: they were used by only 7% of the DT students and 8% of the IT students. The students might have differentiated this strategy as supposed to be used when requesting in a written form.

After the treatment, the number of the students who used *'Would/Could you...?'*, the second most preferred strategy in the pretest, remained almost the same as the number on the pretest, while many of those who used *'Please... directive'*, the most

preferred strategy on the pretest, chose other strategies on the posttest. However, those two strategies were still the most favored forms on the posttest. Overall, the target forms were used by more students on the posttest (39% by DT and 28% by IT) in DCT, but they were used less than in email. Closer examination of the realization patterns for the target forms revealed that DT students who used the targets tended to use the three forms of '*I would appreciate/grateful...*', '*I wonder/was wondering...*', and '*Would it be possible/Is it possible...?*', while IT students tended to use only '*Would you mind...?*'. A possible explanation for this could be that they were focused on more with high input frequency among the DT students in class because they were selected based on the email data by ENSs and they relied on these forms in their DCT as they used them in their email writing. Meanwhile, the IT students did not seem to be influenced much by the email input frequency comparing to the DT students.

TABLE 3
Request Strategies in DCT for Situation 1 (number(%))

Strategy type		DCT			
		Deductive Teaching Group (DT)		Inductive Teaching Group (IT)	
		Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest
Target forms	<i>I would appreciate it/be grateful, if...</i>	0(0%)	5(12%)	0(0%)	2(6%)
	<i>I wonder/was wondering...</i>	0(0%)	5(12%)	0(0%)	3(8%)
	<i>Would it be/Is it possible...?</i>	0(0%)	5(12%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
	<i>Would you mind...?</i>	2(5%)	1(3%)	1(3%)	5(14%)
Target forms total		2(5%)	16(39%)	1(3%)	10(28%)
Non-target	<i>Do you think you could...?</i>	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
	<i>Would/Could you/I...?</i>	9(22%)	8(20%)	7(19%)	7(19%)
	<i>Can/Will you/I...?, may I...?</i>	3(7%)	1(2%)	1(3%)	2(5%)
	<i>Please..., directive</i>	18(44%)	6(15%)	17(46%)	12(32%)
	<i>I want..., I hope..., I would like...</i>	3(7%)	7(17%)	3(8%)	3(8%)
	Others	6(15%)	3(7%)	8(21%)	3(8%)
Non-target forms total		39(95%)	25(61%)	36(97%)	27(72%)
Total		41(100%)	41(100%)	37(100%)	37(100%)

3) Summary of Situation 1

In regard to the instructional effectiveness both in email writing and DCT posttest results, the similar tendency was found: the target forms were used in email by 40% of the DT students and by 33% of the IT students and they were used in DCT by 39% of the DT students and 28% of the IT students after the treatment. The differences between the pretest and the posttest results were statistically significant in both

groups: $\chi^2=18.10$, $df=1$, $p<.001$ for the DT email; $\chi^2=6.82$, $df=1$, $p<.01$ for the IT email; $\chi^2=13.95$, $df=1$, $p<.001$ for the DT DCT; $\chi^2=8.65$, $df=1$, $p<.01$ for the IT DCT. More target forms were used by the DT group (40% in email and 39% in DCT) than the IT group (33% in email and 28% in DCT) after the treatment, even though the difference was not statistically significant between the DT and IT posttest ($\chi^2=0.42$, $df=1$, $p<1$ in email; $\chi^2=1.26$, $df=1$, $p<1$ in DCT). In conclusion, the students' use of request strategies both in email and DCT was affected positively by the treatment with email input frequency and email writing practice, while the two different instructional methods resulted in slight difference with a slightly better result in DT than IT.

2. Focus-on-form and function effect in Situation 2

In Situation 2 where a request is made between close friends, nine different kinds of target request strategies were provided for the instruction according to the ENSs' email data in the same situation. The students were exposed to those various request strategies and encouraged to use them in their production by email writing in the treatment sessions. After the treatment, students' use of request strategies in Situation 2 was tested through an email writing test and a DCT.

1) Email in Situation 2

TABLE 4
Request Strategies in Email for Situation 2 (number(%))

Strategy type	Email			
	Deductive Teaching Group (DT)		Inductive Teaching Group (IT)	
	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest
<i>I would appreciate it/be grateful, if...</i>	0(0%)	1(2%)	0(0%)	1(3%)
<i>I wonder/was wondering...</i>	0(0%)	3(7%)	0(0%)	6(17%)
<i>Would it be/Is it possible...?</i>	0(0%)	2(5%)	1(3%)	1(3%)
<i>Would you mind...?</i>	2(5%)	3(7%)	1(3%)	0(0%)
<i>Do you think you could...?</i>	1(2%)	0(0%)	1(3%)	1(3%)
<i>Would/Could you/I...?</i>	8(19%)	12(29%)	11(31%)	10(28%)
<i>Can/Will you/I...?, may I...?</i>	10(24%)	7(17%)	7(19%)	9(25%)
<i>Please..., directive</i>	12(29%)	4(10%)	7(19%)	5(14%)
<i>I want/hope/would like...</i>	7(17%)	6(14%)	7(20%)	2(6%)
Others	2(4%)	4(10%)	1(2%)	1(3%)
Total	42(100%)	42(100%)	36(100%)	36(100%)

In the pretest results for Situation 2, students' request strategies both in email and

DCT were limited to the use of four kinds of strategies: 'Please...' (29% by DT and 19% by IT in email; 38% by DT and 36% by IT in DCT), 'Can/Will you...?' (24% by DT and 19% by IT in email; 31% by DT and 33% by IT in DCT), 'Would/Could you...?' (19% by DT and 31% by IT in email; 21% by DT and 22% by IT in DCT) and 'I want/hope/would like...' (17% by DT and 19% by IT in email; 0% by DT and 3% by IT in DCT) as shown in Table 4 and 5. Those four types of strategies took up 89% of the uses by DT and IT students on the pretest email. However, after the treatment, their request strategies became varied with the employment of more conventionally indirect expressions, such as 'Would you mind...?' or 'I was wondering...'. The number of the students who used 'Please...directive' decreased on the posttest: from 29% to 10% in email by DT; from 19% to 14% by IT. DT students chose more varied forms, such as 'I wonder/wondering...', 'Would it be/Is it possible...?', or 'Would you mind...?', and the reason is speculated as they were given more explicit explanation on various forms than IT students during the treatment sessions. However, the distributional difference between pretest and posttest results is statistically insignificant for both DT and IT.

2) Discourse Completion Test in Situation 2

TABLE 5
Request Strategies in DCT for Situation 2 (number(%))

Strategy type	DCT			
	Deductive Teaching Group (DT)		Inductive Teaching Group (IT)	
	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest
<i>I would appreciate it/be grateful, if...</i>	0(0%)	1(2%)	0(0%)	1(3%)
<i>I wonder/was wondering...</i>	0(0%)	6(14%)	0(0%)	4(11%)
<i>Would it be/Is it possible...?</i>	0(0%)	1(2%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
<i>Would you mind...?</i>	1(2%)	6(14%)	1(3%)	7(19%)
<i>Do you think you could...?</i>	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
<i>Would/Could you/I...?</i>	9(21%)	7(17%)	8(22%)	10(28%)
<i>Can/Will you/I...?, may I...?</i>	13(31%)	7(17%)	12(33%)	4(11%)
<i>Please..., directive</i>	16(38%)	3(7%)	13(36%)	6(17%)
<i>I want/hope/ would like...</i>	0(0%)	8(19%)	1(3%)	4(11%)
Others	3(7%)	3(7%)	1(3%)	0(0%)
Total	41(100%)	41(100%)	37(100%)	37(100%)

The request strategies students employed in DCT were limited to three types on the pretest: 'Would/Could you...?' by 21% of DT and 22% of IT students; 'Can/Will

you...?' by 31% of DT and 33% of IT students; *Please...*' by 38% of DT and 36% of IT students. Those three types took up about 90% of the total uses by the DT and IT students. However, the treatment led the students to using more varied kinds of strategy on the posttest as in Table 5. The tendencies in the change after the treatment were similar in between DT and IT. The use of *I wonder/ was wondering...*, *Would you mind...?* and *I want/hope/would like...* was increased most both in DT and IT groups. The number of the students who used *Please...directive* considerably decreased in the posttest: from 38% to 7% in email by DT; from 36% to 17% in email by IT. The distributional difference between pretest and posttest results is significant both in DT and IT group: $\chi^2=30.52$, $df=8$, $p<.001$ for the DT DCT; $\chi^2=19.10$, $df=7$, $p<.01$ for the IT DCT.

3) Summary for Situation 2

The instructional intervention appeared effective as the kinds of request strategies students used were found to have become varied according to the instructional goal set for Situation 2. In the treatment sessions, students received email data input containing numerous examples with target forms and was given opportunities of email writing exercises for output. Interestingly, students both in DT and IT chose more varied forms in DCT than in email writing. A possible explanation for this could be that students might have differentiated the discourse style of DCT from email, even though there was no explanation on any difference of oral requests and email requests in class. However, the posttest result of DT group did not show significant difference from IT group both in email and DCT. That is, different ways of instruction did not make significant difference on the students' choice of request strategies in Situation 2.

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This study set out to answer two questions. The first question concerned whether the deductive and inductive instructional methods influence learners' production differently; the second sought to determine whether the instruction using email can lead to the use of target forms in their oral production (open-ended DCT) as well as in their email and how the two groups show different results in using target forms after the treatment. The findings of the quantitative analysis can be summarized as follows: First, the deductive instruction resulted in the more use of target forms than the

inductive instruction, but the difference was not statistically significant. So the difference in relation to the degrees of the instructional explicitness (as deductive being more explicit and inductive less explicit) was not found very big. Second, the focus-on-form and function instruction using email writing practice affected the students' output results in DCTs as well as email messages. Significant difference was found between pretest and posttest results in both cases. In addition, even though the communication mode differed (one is written and the other is oral), written form of the productive language using practice had a positive impact both on written and oral production in acquiring request strategies. This might have been possible because similar request head acts are used in similar request situations no matter what the communication mode is.

In terms of the retention effect, even though the posttest was administered about 5-6 weeks after the treatment sessions, the findings indicated that the students still retained the target forms quite well. Moreover, considering the fact that the students' English level is low and they had exposed to very limited kinds of input some of which are inappropriate for the situations like Situation 1 in their previous learning in high school, the result of the posttest is very encouraging. However, delayed retention effect could not be investigated in this study, since this study was conducted during the 4-month semester period only.

In conclusion, this research demonstrated that the target pragmatic features were found to be more effectively learned when they were taught under the condition in which a relatively high degree of explicit instruction was realized with explicit metapragmatic information and rich input data. Thus, the deductive instruction which is linked to extensive and repetitive exposure and practice is more likely to advance the students' pragmatic competence. This research finding on the effectiveness of the way and degree of input enhancement conforms to the findings of previous study which revealed the relatively superior effectiveness of explicit and form-focused instruction to inductive and gab-noticing instruction. In sum, this study has provided some evidence that instruction in pragmatics can make a difference in a foreign language context, but that a deductive approach may yield better results. When developing an instructional model to teach pragmatic routines, this is the point to be specially considered under the prevailing SLA hypotheses. However, whether the output of target features actually contributed to increasing the learners' noticing chance and thus to the development of their pragmatic competence was not explored in this study, as the output production was carried out for both groups. Further research on the output effect as well as input effect of target features in advancing

pragmatic competence is needed.

REFERENCES

- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics? In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.) *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 13-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Dornyei, Z. (1998). Do language learners recognize pragmatic violations? Pragmatic versus grammatical awareness in instructed L2 learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(2), 233-262.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. (1993). Learning the rules of academic talk: A longitudinal study of pragmatic change. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 279-304.
- Bialystok, E. (1993). Symbolic representation and attentional control in pragmatic competence. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 43-57). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Billmyer, K. (1990). "I really like your lifestyle": ESL learners learning how to compliment. *Penn Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 6, 31-48.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1982). Learning how to say what you mean in a second language: A study of the speech act performance of learners of Hebrew as a second language. *Applied Linguistics*, 3, 29-59.
- Boxer, D., & Pickering, L. (1995). Problems in the presentation of speech acts in ELT materials: The case of complaints. *ELT Journal*, 49, 44-58.
- Cohen, A., & Olshtain, E. (1993). The production of speech acts by EFL learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 33-56.
- Han, Jong-im. (1999). Teaching communicative act rules of request. *English Teaching*, 54(4), 121-145.
- House, J. (1996). Developing pragmatic fluency in English as a foreign language: Routines and metapragmatic awareness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18, 225-252.
- Jeon, Young-Sook. (1996). *A descriptive study on the development of pragmatic competence by Korean learners of English in the speech act of complimenting*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Texas A & M University, College Station.
- Kasper, G. (1996). Introduction: Pragmatics in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18, 145-148.
- Kasper, G. (2001). Classroom research on interlanguage pragmatics. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.) *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 13-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kim, Dae Jin. (1998). Developing pragmatic competence of young EFL learners through interactive book reading and role playing. *English Teaching*, 53(4), 31-61.

- Kim, Hye-Ryun. (1998). On the teachability of pragmatic competence to Korean college EFL learners. *Journal of the Applied Linguistics Association of Korea*, 14(2), 127-145.
- Kim, Jeong-ryeol. (2003). Using mail talk to improve English speaking skills. *English Teaching*, 58(4), 349-370.
- Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). New York: Academic Press.
- Moon, Young-In. (1996). *Interlanguage features of Korean EFL learners in the communicative act of complaining*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Indiana University, Bloomington
- Paik, Kyung-Sook. (1998). *A cross-cultural study of compliment and compliment responses in English and Korean*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Seoul National University, Seoul.
- Park, Kyung-Ja, & Nakano, M. (1999). A study on pragmatic functions of apology expressions among Japanese and Korean learners of English. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 3, 225-272.
- Schmidt, R. (1993). Consciousness, learning and interlanguage pragmatics. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 21-42). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning* (Technical Report #9) (pp. 1-6). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.
- Sharwood S. M. (1993). Input enhancement in instructed SLA: Theoretical bases. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 165-179.
- Suh, Jae-Suk. (1998). *Interlanguage requests by Korean learners of English as a second language*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Swain, M. (1996). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 245-256). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. (1998). Focus on form through conscious reflection. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 64-82). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Takahashi, S. (2001). Input enhancement in developing pragmatic competence. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.) *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 171-199). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tateyama, Y. (2001). Explicit and implicit teaching of pragmatic routines. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.) *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 200-222). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yang, Eun-Mi. (2000). *Interlanguage features of the email request acts by Korean*

- English speakers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Chungnam National University, Daejon.
- Yang, Eun-Mi. (2001a). Organizational patterns of the requestive email by Korean English speakers. *English Teaching*, 56(2), 3-30.
- Yang, Eun-Mi. (2001b). The use of downgraders by Korean English speakers and American English native speakers in requestive email. *English Language and Literature Teaching*, 7(1), 51-66.
- Yang, Eun-Mi. (2004). A study on routine formulas and downgraders of request act in middle school English textbooks. *English Teaching*, 59(3), 197-214.
- Yang, Eun-Mi. (2005). A study on routine formulas and downgraders of request act in high school English textbooks. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 11(2), 111-134.

Examples in: English

Applicable Languages: English

Applicable Levels: Secondary, Adult

Eun-Mi Yang
General Education Division
Kkottongnae Hyundo University of Social Welfare
387 Sangsam-ri, Hyundo-myun, Cheongwon-gun
Chungbuk 363-823, S. Korea
Tel: (043) 270-0141
Fax: (042) 270-0120
Email: emyang@kkot.ac.kr

Received in April, 2006

Reviewed in May, 2006

Revised version received in June, 2006