The Effects of Deductive and Inductive Interventions on Developing Iranian EFL Learners' Pragmatic Competence: An Investigation of the Speech Act of Request

J. Fathi[1*], B. Feozollahi[2]

تأثیر آموزش مستقیم و غیر مستقیم بر گسترش توانایی کاربرد شناسی زبان آموزان ایرانی: بررسی کارگفت درخواست

جلیل فتحی[۱*]، بهنام فیض الهی[۲]

Abstract

Since the 1990s, an accumulated body of empirical studies have investigated the main and differential effects of various approaches to second language (L2) pragmatic instruction. To contribute to this line of research, the present study aimed at investigating the effect of deductive and inductive instruction on the development of the speech acts of requests by Iranian EFL learners. In so doing, 51 Iranian EFL English-major students were randomly assigned to either the deductive group (DG) group (n = 24) or the inductive group (IG) group (n = 27). (IG). Both groups were provided with video clips of short conversations including the speech acts of request. The experimental treatment for the DG followed explicitness and deduction accompanied by a variety of drills, whereas the instruction for the IG involved input enhancement techniques. Both deductive and inductive methods of instruction adopted in the present study were operationalized according to the principles underlying the paradigms of Focus on Forms (FonFS) and Focus on Forms (FonF). Speech act development of the two groups was measured through a 10-item Written Discourse Completion Test (WDCT) at the pre-treatment and post-treatment phases of the study. The results obtained from administered WDCT revealed that both deductive and inductive instruction had a significant effect on the learners' development of requests. Further analysis of the findings revealed that inductive instruction was more effective than deductive instruction. The findings offer theoretical and pedagogical implications.

Key Words: interlanguage pragmatics, deductive instruction, inductive instruction, speech act

چکیده

حجم وسیعی از تحقیقات عملی از سال ۱۹۹۰، اثرات اصلی و تفاضلی رویکردهای مختلف درتدریس کاربرد شناسی در زبان دوم را بررسی کرده اند. در همین راستا، هدف مطالعه حاضر بررسی تاثیرات تدریس مستقیم (قیاسی) و غیر مستقیم (استقرایی) بر یادگیری کارگفت درخواست توسط زبان آموزان ایرانی است. به همین منظور، ۵۱ دانشجوی زبان انگلیسی در ایران بصورت تصادفی در گروهای مستقیم (تعداد=۲۴) و غیر مستقیم (تعداد=۲۷) قرار داده شدند. ویدیوها و نماهنگ های تصویری کوتاه در مورد کارگفت درخواست در اختیار هردو گروه قرارگرفت. آموزش عملی برای گروه غیر مستقیم شامل آموزش آشکار و مهارت قیاس به همراه تمارین گوناگون بوده، در حالیکه دوره آموزشی گروه غیرمستقیم متشکل از تکنیک های بهبود داده بود. هر دو روش مستقیم و غیر مستقیم که در مطالعه حاضر مورد استفاده قرارگرفتند، بر اساس اصول بنیادی رویکرد های آموزش فرم محور و آموزش معنا محور بکار گرفته شدند. یادگیری کارگفت ها در هر دو گروه از طریق یک آزمون کتبی تکاملی گفتمان در مراحل پیش و پس آموزش سنجیده شد. نتایج حاصل از آزمون کتبی تکاملی گفتمان نشانگر این بود که هم آموزش مستقیم و هم غیرمستقیم تاثیر چشمگیری بر یادگیری کارگفت درخواست توسط دانشجویان دارد. تحلیل های متعاقب یافته ها بیانگر تاثیرگذاری بیشتر آموزش غیرمستقیم نسبت به آموزش مستقیم بود. یافته های تحقیق مورد نظر کاربردهای نظری و عملی را در پی دارد.

کلید واژهها: کاربردشناسی بینازبانی، آموزش مستقیم، آموزش غیرمستقیم، کنش کلام

1. Assistant Professor of Applied Linguistics, University of Kurdistan

2. MA in TEFL, Imam Khomaini International University, Qazvin

Email: jfathi13@yahoo.com

۱. استادیار آموزش زبان انگلیسی دانشگاه کردستان، سنندج، ایران

۲.کارشناسی ارشد آموزش زبان انگلیسی، دانشگاه بین المللی امام خمینی، قزوین

* نویسنده مسئول:

1. Introduction

There have been several similar definitions on the pragmatic competence since its advent out of Hymes' (1972) response to the notion of competence put forward by Chomsky (1965). Hymes (1972) added appropriateness of contextual interaction to knowledge of grammar rules. Pragmatic competence is also known as the speaker' and writer's capability to achieve goals requiring both accomplishing the told tasks and stablishing interpersonal relationships with the readers or hearers (Leech, 1983). Crystal (1991) put it another way as the competence related to the language use in social interactions. The last but not least, LoCastro (2003) defines it as "the study of speaker's and hearer's meaning created in their joint actions that includes both linguistic and non-linguistic signals in the context of socioculturally organized activities" (p. 15). The definitions imply that the communicators in a social context need to have a command of linguistic rules, conversational norms, social conventions, and the potential to apply them in a social interaction (Taguchi, 2015). In fact, the speaker in a conversation must make sure that his partner has understood the massage, and equally, the hearer must show signs indicative of reception and comprehension of the message (Schmidt & Richards, 1980).

In doing so, the interlocutors will have to gain knowledge about the usage of different components of pragmatic competence like speech acts. Broadly defined, speech act theory is all about uses of language and functions, or we can say that speech acts are all the actions we perform while speaking. Speech acts include orders, requests, apologies, and suggestions (Hymes, 1972). In using speech acts several factors must be considered; the speakers need to be aware of the appropriateness of them before using it; and they also need to consider the degree of politeness in their speech according to the target culture (Koike, 1989). Therefore, the context and the participants' behavior in the context is of utmost importance.

Among the speech acts, request is to be known the most dangerous and threatening one. It is a very common speech act in everyone's life by which we can improve our social relationship. A routine definition of it can be the act of politely or officially asking for something. It also has been looked at as a supportive action that can help a community stick together, but the hard part is the cross-cultural differences. Therefore through speech act of requesting much of the target language context can be guessed (Abdul Sattar & Farnia, 2014). When somebody gets someone to do something, he/she is making a request (Blum-Kulka, 1991). It has been seen as face-threatening because they are capable of being intrusive or demanding which necessitates the requester to lower the imposition involved in it (Brown & Levinson, 1978).

A notion very close to but different from pragmatics is the idea of Interlanguage Pragmatics (ILP). It can be said that it is an amalgamation of two different fields of studies being a branch in Second Language Acquisition Research. The word interlanguage may mislead us to see morphology or phonology in ILP, but the notion suggests information about pragmatics as a substrata. To be precise, ILP is a matter of studding nonnative speakers' use and acquisition of linguistic action patterns in a second language interaction.

So, ILP mainly connotes the comprehension and production of linguistic action according to discourse regulation which its main focus is on the use of speech acts and politeness (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993).

The importance of the speaker/hearer behavior in a conversation and the sensitivity of usage of the speech acts in communication has raised the question that whether the instruction of pragmatic features like speech acts are best learned through classroom environment or not. Several studies have come to the conclusion that classroom instruction for learning speech acts have brought about positive results; Kasper (2001) is an example which indicates the efficacy of classroom pedagogy for speech act learning. Similarly, Kasper and Rose (2002) suggested that pragma-linguistic forms and socio-pragmatic rules are usually weak in a way that they cannot attract the attention and focus of the learners in natural settings without instruction. Takahashi (2001) also necessitates instruction for learning pragmatics. Moreover, instruction of the pragmatics itself is divided into explicit and implicit.

Explicit instruction is the way that the teacher explains and discusses the rules of the course, but in implicit instruction the teachers tries to engage the learners' attention and focus without direct metalinguistic discussion or explanation (Qi & Lai, 2017). Explicit way of teaching has been shown to be a facilitator in pragmatic development of the learners and a consciousness-raising method engaging the learners' attention (Kasper & Rose, 2002; Alcon-Soler, 2005; Takahashi, 2001; Farrokhi & Atashian, 2012). Explicit way of teaching is composed of inductive and deductive learning which stem from second language acquisition theories.

Inductive theories of learning are defined as ascending or bottom-up, going from bits of information or data and add up the other parts to construct principles or rules to explain the subject of learning. It can be said that the rules of a subject matter are not introduced in the beginning of the course, the examples or building blocks of the construct are presented instead. The detailed parts of principles are accumulated and create relations among the parcel and parts to form a network of relationships ending up in a complete explanation (McLaughlin, 1987a). Cross (1991) suggests that if learners are exposed to proper examples, their task of learning will be kind of effortless for them in inductive way of learning.

Deductive theories, on the other hand, are defied as descending or top-down. In this type the principles are introduced at the beginning then the rules are deduced from the principles. At first, the explanations are provided and elaborated, then the details or the connections are shed light on in order to extract additional laws and rules. Therefore, the main principles in deductive theories are independent in the sense that their presence does not have any prerequisite like derived laws or rules, and that they generate different new bits and definitions on their own (McLaughlin, 1987a). In spited of the existence of an accumulated body of research dealing with the effect of deductive and deductive instructions on interlanguage pragmatics development, there is a great deal of controversy over the relative effect of either of the two approaches (Kasper & Roever, 2005). To contribute to this line of research, the present study aimed at investigating the effect of

deductive and inductive instruction on the development of the speech acts of requests by Iranian EFL learners. Moreover, the differential effect of deductive and inductive methods of instruction is taken into account.

2. Previous Empirical studies on deductive and inductive pragmatic instruction

To check the effects of input-enhanced instruction on Iranian EFL learners' production of pragmatically appropriate and grammatically accurate suggestions, Ghavamnia, Eslami-Rasekh and Dastjerdi (2014) used five intact classes as the experimental and the control groups in a sixteen-week course. The first group went through the instruction of metapragmatic exolanation, the second one experienced form-comparison, the third received typographically enhanced input along with input flooding, the fourth group was under the instruction of meaning-focused input enhancement, and the last group was considered as the control group. The data was collected through a pre- and a post-test including two production tasks. The findings suggested that the results from the treatment groups were statically different from that of the control group.

Derakhshan and Arabmofrad (2018) did a study on the impact of video enhanced instruction on the pragmatic comprehension of speech acts of apology, request, and refusal among Iranian intermediate EFL learners. To this end, having administered the Oxford Quick Placement test, 69 Iranian intermediate EFL learners randomly assigned to four groups of metapragmatic, form-search, interactive translation, and control. The treatment included 20 video vignettes for each speech act taken from different episodes of *Friends* and *Seinfeld* sitcoms and *Annie Hall* movie during twice instruction in a week. The results from the multiple-choice discourse completion test revealed that the three experimental groups developed from pre- to post-test. To locate the differences among the treatment groups, a post hoc test of Tukey was ran. It was concluded that the metapragmatic group outperformed the other treatment groups followed by the form-search group, interactive translation group, and the control group.

Bagherkazemi (2013) investigate the effects of the immediate and delayed effect of explicit video-driven metapragmatic awareness-raising on Iranian EFL learners' production of English apologies, requests, and refusals. In so doing, there were 54 intermediate EFL learners assigned to an experimental or metapragmatic awareness raising group and a control group. Each speech act took three sessions to be taught in the form of video input presentation attached by a teacher-fronted presentation, a video transcript-based speech act recognition and reasoning task in the second session, and five multiple choice discourse completion and reasoning task in the third session. A twenty-four-item Written Discourse Completion Test was taken by the participants as the pre-test, immediate post-test and delayed post-test. The results revealed no significant improvement from the immediate to delayed post-test, but totally the experimental groups improved more than the control group.

Alco´n Soler (2005) examined the efficacy of explicit versus implicit instruction on learners' knowledge and ability to use request strategies. To this end, one hundred and thirty-two students were randomly assigned to three groups of explicit, implicit, and

control. The treatment material were taken from different episodes of the TV series *Stargate.* The explicit group was under the instruction of direct awareness-raising tasks and written metapragmatic feedback on the use of appropriate requests. On the other hand, the implicit group experienced instruction of typographical tools of request strategies and a set of implicit awareness-raising tasks. The findings illustrated that both experimental groups gained advantage over the control group. However, it was the explicit group which showed more improved results than the implicit group.

Duan and Wannaruk (2010) compared the effects of explicit and implicit instruction in the use of English refusals. In so doing, sixty-two participants were selected from two intact groups, 32 being in an explicit instruction group and 29 in an implicit instruction group. The instructor aimed at teaching refusals to invitations, suggestions, offers and requests. A written Discourse Completion Test (DCT) was chosen as the pre- and post-test as the quantitative data. Then the answers were classified as qualitative data. The results illustrated that explicit teaching of refusals was more effective than implicit teaching of them.

Taguchi (2015) conducted a research study to review the literature related to the role of instruction and the effective methods in instruction of pragmatics using fifty-eight instructional interventions through electronic bibliographical searches. In the conclusion part he reached at some generalizations: 1) instruction needs to be there for pragmatics, 2) explicit teaching is favored over implicit teaching, 3) implicit teaching would work as beneficial as explicit method if it involves noticing and processing, 4) if learners are engaged in the process of learning as active learners not just as input receivers, they could face better results at the end.

House (1996) conducted a study to see the effect of explicit and implicit modes of the instruction of the same course of speech acts and conversational routines with German upper-intermediate university students. The students experienced teacher-centered explicit information about socio-pragmatic conditions in explicit version, whereas in implicit version, they did not undergo explicit information about the subject matter. The students listened to their audiotapes of their language behavior at various stages. The findings revealed that explicit instruction group was effective followed by implicit instruction group.

Similarly, Takahashi (2001) formed four groups of input enhancement conditions to teach target request strategies explicitly; in the first group students received explicit instruction with highest degree of input enhancement; the second group received form-comparison instruction of request speech acts with lower degree of input enhancement than the first group; the form-search explicit instruction had lower degree of input enhancement than the second group; and the last group experienced meaning-focused which had the lowest degree of input enhancement among the four groups. The instructions took four weeks of ninety-minute sessions. The results showed the efficacy of the explicit instruction over the other three groups.

Rose and Ng (2001) aimed at investigating the efficacy of the deductive and inductive approaches in the teaching compliments and responses to compliments. To this end, there

were 44 undergraduate student divided into three groups: two experimental groups and one control group. The inductive group did not experienced any explicit information about the target structures but the deductive group experienced explicit instruction. The deductive group turned out to gain higher proficiency of using compliments.

Takimoto (2008) used 60 adult native speakers of Japanese in three groups of treatment and one control group to find the effects of deductive and inductive teaching approaches to the acquisition of pragmatic competence on learners of English as a foreign language. One of the treatment groups experienced deductive instruction, the other one experienced inductive instruction with problem-solving tasks, and the last group experienced inductive instruction with structured input tasks. The results of post-test and the follow-up test showed that the three treatment groups outperformed the control group. However, the deductive instruction group showed a reduction in the positive effects of the treatment between the post-test and the follow-up test.

Qi and Lai (2017) did a study to check the effects of deductive instruction and inductive instruction on learners' development of pragmatic competence in the teaching of Chinese as a second language. For this purpose, forty-two intermediate learners were randomly assigned to the two treatment groups; an inductive instruction group of speech acts, and a deductive instruction group of speech acts. The data collection procedure was an open-ended discourse completion task compared across the two groups. The findings revealed that inductive instruction was statically more effective than that of deductive instruction.

Glaser (2013) did a study to merge explicit instruction with inductive mode of teaching Pragmatics in ESL. The researcher believes that there are studies to put explicit and implicit instruction in front of each other, and deductive versus inductive instruction of pragmatics too. It has been said that explicit and deductive or implicit and inductive can be used interchangeably. The writer then emphasizes the integration of explicit way of teaching with inductive mode and believes on the efficacy of it over dichotomous use of them.

In a similar study, Glaser (2016) contrasted the inductive and the deductive approach in the teaching of the pragmatics to find the possible differences through a quasi-experimental study. There were 49 advanced EFL students to experience the instruction of refusals in three ninety-minute lessons during fifteen-week academic semester. In the treatment period, the deductive group was instructed through metapragmatic rules directly at the beginning of the course, while the inductive group just faced those rules after engaging in language use and guided discovery. The data collection tools were a role play and a discourse completion test in pre- and post-test format. The results suggested that the improvement in the inductive group was higher than that of deductive group.

3. Research questions

1. Does deductive instruction have any significant effect on the Iranian EFL learners' development of the speech act of request?
2. Does inductive instruction have any significant effect on the Iranian EFL learners' development of the speech act of request?

3. Is inductive instruction more effective than explicit deductive instruction in Iranian EFL learners' development of the speech act of request?

4. Method
4.1. Participants

To accomplish the purpose of the present study, a sample of intermediate 51 Iranian English-major undergraduate students were recruited. The participants were the students of two intact classes at an Islamic Azad University in Iran. The two classes were randomly assigned to either the deductive group (DG) group (n = 24) or the inductive group (IG) group (n = 27). The age range of the participants varied from 20 to 26, with an average of 22.3. The groups included both male and female students. Prior to the initiation of the treatment, an *Oxford Placement Test* (OPT) was administered to the participants of the study. The purpose of the administration of OPT was to ensure the homogeneity of the students in terms of general language proficiency. The result of an independent samples T-test for the mean scores of OPT for both groups indicated that the mean scores of the two groups were not statistically different.

4.2. Instruments

For the purpose of the present study, two instruments were employed: Oxford Placement Test (QPT), and a Written Discourse Completion Test (WDCT).

4.3. Proficiency Test

To ensure the homogeneity of students in both groups, Oxford Placement Test (OPT: 2004) was administered to the students in both groups. OPT comprises 200 items, measuring listening, grammar ,vocabulary and reading skills. Allan (2004), the designer of the test, argues that the OPT could be used with any number of English learners to ensure efficient, reliable and accurate grading and placing of students into groups at all levels from elementary to advanced. The OPT has been calibrated against the proficiency levels based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), the Cambridge ESOL Examinations, and other major international examinations (Allan, 2004). The reliability index of the test as measured via Cronbach's alpha in the present study was reported to be 0.86.

4.4. Written Discourse Completion Test (WDCT)

The participants' pragmatic competence development of the "request" speech act was measured through a 10-item Written Discourse Completion Test, consisting of 8 situation prompts on the speech act of request. The situations were related to the life of university students and the prompts were sampled in such a way that they could represent various combinations of "power," "distance," and "imposition," as proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). Responses of the participants were rated using Taguchi's (2006) 6-point Likert scale, which takes into account grammaticality as well as situational and discoursal appropriateness. To guarantee inter-rater reliability, two independent trained raters also

rated the responses. Internal consistency of the WDCT, as measured by a Cronbach's Alpha co-efficient, were reported to be 0.82. Cohen's Kappa's inter-rater reliability index was also 0.79.

4.5. Procedure

The experimental intervention of the present study was conducted over a period of 10 weeks. Homogenized English-major undergraduate students, whose language proficiency had been checked by an Oxford Placement Tests (OPT), were randomly assigned to the two groups of the Deductive Group (DG) and the Inductive Group (IG). Prior to the initiation of the treatment, WDCT was administered as the pre-test. The pre-test served to measure the participants' knowledge of request speech act before any instruction. It should be pointed out that both deductive and inductive methods of instruction adopted in the present study were operationalized according to the principles underlying the paradigms of FonFS and FonF (Long, 1996, 1998; Doughty and Williams, 1998). In other words, in both approaches there is some degree of explicitness.

The experimental treatment for the DG followed a FonFS paradigm and was carried out by explicitness and deduction accompanied by a variety of drills. In each session, DG learners first watched a video clip in which the speech act of request occurred in a natural conversation. The video clips were followed by explicit awareness-raising activities and discussions on both pragmalinguistic aspects (i.e. linguistic forms employed to make requests), and sociopragmatic ones (i.e. appropriateness issues concerning the status of participants in the video). Furthermore, DG learners carried out a variety of production tasks and role-plays. It is worth noting that DG learners watched video situations with nothing written on the screen and they received transcripts of the situations without any bold-faced or highlighted words.

With regard to IG experimental treatment, a FonF paradigm was adopted, a procedure in which input enhancement techniques were taken as the point of departure. The identical video clips were presented to the learners in the IG. Nevertheless, the learners were provided by the captions on the video dealing with the sociopragmatic aspect of the situation. In other words, the captions were employed instead of metapragmatic discussions used for the DG. Additionally, learners in IG were provided with the transcripts in which words used to make requests became bold-faced. This bold-facing, acting as an input enhancement technique, intended to indirectly draw learners' attention to forms, function and appropriate usage without any explanation on grammar or metapragmaitc information about appropriate use. Finally, during the last session, WDCT acting as the post-test was re-administered to the students of both groups.

5. Results

The purpose of the first and second research questions was to investigate whether deductive instruction and inductive instruction have any significant effect on the Iranian EFL learners' development of the speech act of request. In so doing, analyses of paired

samples t-test were run to compare the WDCT scores of the students in both groups in pre-test and post-test.

First the change in the WDCT scores from pre-test to post-test for both groups was investigated. As it can be seen from the results (Table 1), the change in the WDCT mean scores of the Deductive group was statistically significant ($t = -3.84$, $p < 0.05$). Similarly, the change in the WDCT mean scores of the Inductive group was statistically significant ($t = -5.82$, $p < 0.05$). The descriptive statistics revealed that the WDCT mean score of the Deductive group was 10.36 in the pre-test and this value increased to 11.46 on the post-test. In addition, concerning the inductive group, the WDCT pre-test mean score was raised from 10.42 to 11.81 on the post-test.

Table (1): Paired samples *t*-test for WDCT results in each group

Groups	Pre-test		Post-test		t	Sig.
	M	SD	M	SD		
Control	10.36	1.17	11.46	1.29	-3.84	0.03
Experimental	10.42	1.01	11.81	1.47	-5.82	0.00

These results of statistical data analysis revealed that both deductive instruction and inductive instruction had statistically significant effects on the Iranian EFL learners' development of the speech act of request.

Then in order to answer the third research question, an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was carried out to investigate which method of instruction (i.e. deductive or inductive) has been more effective in fostering Iranian EFL learners' development of the speech act of request. According to Hatch and Lazarton (1991), 'ANCOVA makes it possible to control for some variable - perhaps a pre-test score - so that the measurement of dependent variable is adjusted taking into account these initial differences among the subjects.' In other words, the different scores of the pre-test were considered as the covariate. Therefore, an ANCOVA was run to the data to analyze this difference in the post-test scores between the control and the experimental groups. The results of ANCOVA are presented in Table 2.

Table (2): ANCOVA results for WDCT scores.

Source	Type III sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Corrected model	8335.426	2	3792.818	142.178	0.000
Intercept	17.361	1	18.275	.703	0.201
Pre- WDCT	5600.154	1	6675.324	294.201	0.000
Group	357.428	1	279.537	15.213	0.000
Error	761.790	40	25.630		
Total	176,236.000	43			
Corrected total	8472.431	42			

As it can be seen from the Table, both the pre-test scores and the inductive instruction had effect on post-test results. The pre-test results were taken under control by covariance analysis and it was revealed that the inductive instruction had a statistically significant effect on the post-test results ($F = 15.213$, $p < 0.05$). Because the learners in the inductive group improved their performance on WDCT significantly more than the learners in the deductive group, the findings indicated that inductive instruction was more effective than deductive instruction.

6. Discussion

This study aimed at investigating the effect of deductive and inductive methods of instruction on developing Iranian EFL student' pragmatic competence. The speech act under focus was request. The results of the present study find accordance with some of the previous studies, but are also in contradiction with several other previous studies. The first and the second questions had the aim of examining the effects of deductive and inductive instruction on developing Iranian EFL students' pragmatic competence in using request speech acts. The findings indicate that the two methods which are composites of explicit way of teaching request speech acts were proven to be beneficial for Iranian EFL students. Therefore, it can be argued that the findings of the first two research questions support the previous pieces of research suggesting that instruction does make a difference (Norris & Ortega, 2000). The present finding partially supports the finding of Ghavamnia, Eslami-Rasekh, and Dastjerdi (2014) in which they came to the conclusion that input-enhanced way of teaching was more effective than the implicit way. But the present finding is at variance with that of Rezvani, Eslami-Rasekh, and Dastjerdi (2014) in which it was also argued that there was no statically significant difference between the explicit and implicit methods of instruction with regard to their effects on learners' pragmatic development. As other similar studies, Derakhshan and Arabmofrad (2018), Bagherkazemi (2013), Alcón Soler (2005), Duan and Wannaruk (2010), Taguchi (2015), House (1996), and Takahashi (2001) all found out that explicit instruction of pragmatics and particularly different types of speech acts results in more beneficial outcomes than implicit method of teaching.

The third research question of the present study sought to investigate the difference between inductive and deductive teaching of request speech acts. The results demonstrated that inductive teaching is more effective than deductive way of teaching speech acts. The findings of the third question is in a accordance with Glaser (2016), Glaser (2013), Qi and Lai (2017), and Takimoto (2008) which they achieved to the results indicating that explicit inductive teaching of various types of speech acts was shown to be more beneficial than explicit deductive way of teaching them. In contradiction to the findings of the present study, Rose and Ng (2001) did a research to compare and contrast inductive and deductive teaching of pragmatics, particularly speech acts and concluded that the deductive method could foster the pragmatics knowledge of the learners rather than inductive method.
There could be several involved factors contributing to the efficacy of inductive method over deductive method. As suggested by Glaser (2013), inductive way of working can help

to solve complex and dynamic problems. Cross (1991) also indicates that if the students are exposed to proper examples in inductive teaching the task will be easy and create a fine learning environment for the learners. Moreover, inductive teaching can be more engaging than deductive teaching, because in deductive teaching the learner is not involved as in inductive teaching. As the other factors, the age range of students in Iranian EFL context may be a reason to the present outcome. The way the instructor taught the speech act can be also another reason, or the Hawthorne effect could be involved in the study.

7. Conclusion

The present study was an attempt to investigate the effectiveness of deductive instruction and inductive instruction in Iranian EFL learners' acquisition of the speech act of request. The findings revealed that both methods of instruction were effective. However, there was a statistically significant difference between these two instructional conditions, with the inductive instruction having a greater impact on learners' pragmatic development of requests. This finding supports constructivist theories (Zahorik, 1995), underscoring input enhancement and recasts as two consciousness-raising techniques in learning pragmatics. From the theoretical point of view, the present study adds to the research on interlanguage pragmatic instruction, and, more specifically, adds to the body of research exploring the effectiveness of deductive and inductive instructions in EFL pragmatic instruction. As far as practical implications for language education are concerned, EFL practitioners might come up with better learning outcomes if they employ the inductive method in interlanguage pragmatics instruction. Instead of embarking on very explicit, deductive methodologies, EFL teachers could provide students with more problem-solving tasks to help them internalize pragmatic resources deeply. Interlanguage pragmatic development might be demanding for EFL students for three reasons (Liu, 2007): (a) minimal exposure to authentic L2 input; (b) limited opportunities for real-life language use; and (c) inadequate treatment of L2 pragmatic features in the curriculum. Even the students who are linguistically competent may not be necessarily competent in processing pragmatics. As Bardovi-Harlig (2001) rightly points out:

Even grammatically advanced learners show differences from target-like pragmatic norms. That is to say, a learner of high grammatical proficiency will not necessarily possess concomitant pragmatic competence … Advanced NNSs are neither uniformly successful, nor uniformly unsuccessful, pragmatically; however, they are more likely to be less successful as a group than NSs on the same task where contextualized reaction data are available (as in the case of authentic conversations and institutional talk). (p. 14)

Therefore, materials developers, methodologists, and practitioners are recommended to integrate pragmatics into their second and foreign language instruction to foster their learners' pragmatic development.

Concerning the limitations of the study, some points should be taken on the board. First, the researchers utilized only a single outcome measure, WDCT, to evaluate the relative effects of each method of instruction (i.e. deductive or inductive). Since WDCT was based

on the learners' imaginary performance in given situations, the elicitation process is highly controlled and does not ensure naturalistic and authentic data. Future research should employ multiple data elicitation techniques to increase the credibility of the obtained data. Moreover, since the sample size was limited to Iranian intermediate EFL learners, the findings of the present study should be tested with a larger sample size including learners with different proficiency levels, different cultural backgrounds, and different L1 backgrounds.

References

Abdul Sattar, H. Q., & Farnia, M. (2014). A cross-cultural study of request speech act: Iraqi and Malay students. *Applied Research on English Language, 3*(2), 35-54.

Alco´n Soler, E. (2005). Does instruction work for learning pragmatics in the EFL context? *System, 33*, 417-435.

Allan, D. (2004). *Oxford Placement Test*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bagherkazemi, M. (2014). Short-term and long-term impact of video-driven metapragmatic awareness raising on speech act production: A case of Iranian intermediate EFL learners. *Journal of Language and Translation, 4*(2), 25-36.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the em-pirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics? In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 13–32). Cambridge: Cambridge Uni-versity Press.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1991). Interlanguage pragmatics: The case of requests. In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign/ second language pedagogy research* (pp. 255-272). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

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

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

Cross, D. (1991). *A practical handbook of language teaching.* UK: Dotesios.

Crystal, D. (1991). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.

Duan, L., & Wannaruk, A. (2010). The effects of explicit and implicit instruction in English refusals. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics (Bimonthly), 33*(3), 93-109.

Farrokhi, F., & Atashian, S. (2012). The role of refusal instruction in pragmatic development. *World Journal of Education, 2*(4), 85-93. http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/wje.v2n4p85

Ghavamnia, M., Eslami-Rasekh, A., & Dastjerdi, V. (2014). The effects of input-enhanced instruction on Iranian EFL learners' production of appropriate and accurate suggestions. *The Language Learning Journal,* http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2014.972431.

Glaser, K. (2013). The neglected combination: A case for explicit-inductive instruction in teaching pragmatics in ESL. *TESL Canada Journal, 30*(7), 150-163.

Glaser, K. (2016). News from the pragmatics classroom: Contrasting the inductive and the deductive approach in the teaching of pragmatic competence. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 13*(4), 529-561.

Hatch, E., & Lazarton, A. (1991). *The research manual: Design and statistics for applied linguistics*. New York, NY: Newbury House.

House, J. (1996). Developing pragmatic fluency in English as a foreign language. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18,* 225–252.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (Eds), *Sociolinguistics*, (pp. 269–293). Baltimore, MD: Penguin Books.

Kasper, G. 2001. Classroom research on interlanguage pragmatics. In K. Rose and G. Kasper (Eds), *Pragmatics in Language Teaching*, (pp. 33–60). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). Interlanguage pragmatics: An introduction. In G. Kasper, and S. Blum-Kulka (Eds), *Interlanguage Pragmatics*, (pp. 3-17). New York: Oxford University Press.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. (2002). *Pragmatic Development in a Second Language*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Koike, D. A. (1989). Pragmatic competence and adult L2 acquisition: Speech acts in interlanguage. *The Modern Language Journal, 73*(3), 279-289.

Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Harlow, UK: Longman.

Liu, J. (2007). Developing a pragmatics test for Chinese EFL learners. *Language Testing*, *24*(1), 391–415. doi: 10.1177/0265532207077206

LoCastro, V. (2003). *An introduction to pragmatics: social action for language teachers*. Michigan: Michigan Press.

McLaughlin, B. (1987a). *Theories of second-language learning.* London: Edward Arnold.

Norris, J.M. and L. Ortega. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: a research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, *50*, 417–528.

Qi, X., & Lai, C. (2017). The effects of deductive instruction and inductive instruction on learners' development of pragmatic competence in the teaching of Chinese as a second language. *System, 70*, 26-37.

Rezvani, E., Eslami-Rasekh, A. and Vahid Dastjerdi, H. (2014) 'Investigating the effects of explicit and implicit instruction on Iranian EFL learners'pragmatic development: Speech acts of request and suggestion in focus', *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning* , *3*(7). doi: 10.5861/ijrsll.2014.799.

Rose, K. R., & Ng, K. F. (2001). Inductive and deductive teaching of compliments and compliment responses. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 145–169). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Schmidt, R. W., & Richards, J. C. (1980). Speech acts and second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(2), 129-157.

Taguchi, N. (2006). Analysis of appropriateness in a speech act of request in L2 Spanish. *Pragmatics*, *16*(4), 513–533. Retrieved from http://ipra.ua.ac.be/main.aspx?c=*HOME&n=1267

Taguchi, N. (2008). Pragmatic comprehension in Japanese as a foreign language. *Modern Language Journal, 92(*4), 558–576.

Taguchi, N. (2015). Instructed pragmatics at a glance: where instructional studies were, are, and should be going. *Language Teaching, 48*(1), 1–50.

Takahashi, S. (2001). The role of input enhancement in developing pragmatic competence. In K. Rose and G. Kasper (Eds). *Pragmatics in Language Teaching*, (pp. 171–199). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Takimoto, M. (2008). The effects of deductive and inductive instruction on the development of language learners' pragmatic competence. *The Modern Language Journal, 92*(3), 369-386.

Zahorik, J. A. (1995). *Constructivist teaching*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kapp.