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Abstract:
Second language learners’ poor knowledge of pragmatics has recently urged researchers to incorporate teaching pragmatics in language learning classrooms. The present study attempted to investigate the role of collaborative dialogue in request making. To this purpose, 60 male Iranian learners of English took a proficiency test and a dialogue construction task as a pretest. Based on the result of the proficiency test, participants were divided into three groups: two experimental groups (homogenous collaborative group and heterogeneous collaborative group) and a control group. The experimental groups received explicit metapragmatic information on request followed by a dialogue construction task in pairs during 6 sessions of treatment. The control group received the same information but completed the task individually. The results of a one-way ANOVA indicated a significant improvement in producing request making for the two experimental groups. The Scheffe Post-hoc analysis also revealed that the homogenous collaborative group outperformed the heterogeneous collaborative group.
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Introduction

1.1. Preliminaries

Everyone who intends to learn a second or foreign language faces two challenges. The first one is learning the system of the target language and the second one is learning how to use that system in language use (Geis & Harlow, 1995). As pointed out by Murphy and Neu (1995) since the introduction of the concept of communicative competence by Hymes (1972), there has been much emphasis on the importance of learning the appropriate use of the target linguistic forms in context. But the most challenging problem of language learners (Geis & Harlow, 1995) lies in the fact that there is an extraordinary amount of stylistic, politeness, and register variation cross-linguistically that choosing from a large number of existing utterances, which differ interactionally, is not an easy task. Research in interlanguage pragmatics has also shown that even advanced learner’s speech act digress from the pattern of target language which causes their failure to convey their intended illocutionary point or politeness value (Blum-Kulka, 1991). Interlanguage pragmatics deals with the way language is used within a social context (Gass & Selinker, 2008).

Pragmatics can be referred to the study of meaning which includes not only the literal and exact meaning of words and sentences but also those features of meaning that develop out of linguistic performance, intention of the speaker, knowledge that speaker and listener shared about world, and other materials that relate linguistic utterances to the general context in which they occur (Falk, 1978). Then pragmatics forms a big part of any language and, accordingly, is one crucial factor in learning a language, on the other hand, learning pragmatics is the biggest problem for most language learners as well. Hence, pragmatics
acquisition has constantly been receiving attention in second language (L2) pedagogy and research in which one of the hot debates is identifying the most effective and efficient ways of teaching pragmatics (Alcon-Soler, 2005).

The prominent role of pragmatic competence in second and foreign language learning has received even a greater emphasis by theorists and researchers in recent decades (Ghobadi & Fahim, 2009). Consequently, numerous types of approaches, techniques, exercises and practices for teaching pragmatics have been introduced to the field. The effect of different instructional methods, including explicit and implicit teaching, input processing instruction, and skill acquisition theory have been compared in more recent studies (e.g., Alcón-Soler, 2005; Dastjerdi & Rezvani, 2010). Theoretical assumptions behind these methods have informed us about underlying cognitive mechanisms which are hidden in pragmatics learning (Taguchi & Kim, 2016). The concept that is added to the teaching of pragmatics is collaborative dialogue.

Learners would benefit from collaborative dialogue to revise themselves and their partners and increase their grammatical accuracy. Collaborative dialogues go beyond just language forms. In fact, they generate moments in which learners talk about the form and its relevance to the function and context of language use. However, in previous studies (e.g., Kim, 2008; Nassaji & Tian, 2010) collaborative dialogues have mostly concentrated on grammar and vocabulary and they have not targeted pragmatics in their studies. For instance, Nassaji and Tian (2010) compared collaborative and individual task condition on phrasal verbs when learners performed two different tasks. They concluded that collaborative tasks resulted in a greater accuracy of task completion than individual tasks. Therefore, their studies showed that collaborative dialogue is effective in learning grammar. In another study, Kim (2008)
compared L2 Korean individual group and collaborative group’s vocabulary learning. The result showed that the collaborative group performed better in the vocabulary test than the individual group.

1.2. Statement of the Problem and Purpose of the Study

Pragmatic competence which is the ability to communicate and interpret in social context meaningfully is important for L2 proficiency. The instruction of pragmatics has gained greater attention when pragmatics in communicative competence model gained explicit recognition. Schmidt’s (2001) noticing hypothesis and explicit vs. implicit teaching motivated by the hypothesis recently dominate the field of instructing pragmatics.

Although implicit and explicit teaching have prevailed in recent studies, new framework of pragmatic instruction has been added to this field (Taguchi & Kim, 2016). The concept that is relevant to this study is collaborative dialogue in the construction of linguistic knowledge. Collaborative dialogue is a form of output used for a cognitive function because language mediates learners’ collaboration to solve linguistic problems and jointly construct knowledge (Swain & Lapkin, 2002).

Because tasks are considered vehicles that increase interaction and negotiation, collaborative dialogue during task performance has received an increasing attention in the field of task-based language teaching. Previous studies (e.g., Kim, 2008; Nassaji & Tian, 2010; Storch, 1999) compared the effect of collaborative dialogue during interactive tasks with individual task conditions on vocabulary and grammar learning. However, limited studies have attempted to investigate the effect of collaborative dialogue on pragmatics. Previous studies had investigated the effectiveness of pair work and individual work on pragmatics (Taguchi & Kim, 2016) or pair work on vocabulary learning (Dobao, 2014), but to my best
knowledge, few studies were done on the proficiency of pairs in pragmatics especially request making. Then, the present study aimed to compare the homogeneous and heterogeneous groups in learning request. So it tries to examine the effects of collaborative dialogue on request making. Request making refers to speech act of request that is made to someone in a greater power and distance or lower power and distance. This study intends to shed some light on the influence of collaborative dialogue on learning request making when learners are heterogeneous or homogeneous.

1.3. Significance of the Study

It should suffice to say that the importance of pragmatics in SLA is not deniable. The results of this study have practical implications for ESL/EFL learners, teachers, material developers, and syllabus designers. Collaborative dialogue can help learners negotiate and co-construct pragmatic knowledge. In fact, learners can discuss pragmatic forms and contextual features associated with them, and develop a joint understanding of the principles underlying the associations.

By providing collaborative dialogue, teachers can help learners internalize the materials and try to be self-regulated. Therefore, it is important for teachers to identify strategies and techniques to help learners improve their pragmatics.

And also the result of this study help material developers and syllabus designers in deciding what information might include in their syllabus, which parts should be emphasized, and what activities, tasks, and materials should be considered to support L2 learning.

1.4. Research Questions and Hypothesis

The present study intended to address the following questions:

1) Does collaborative dialogue have any effect on request making?
2) If yes, are there any differences between homogeneous and heterogeneous groups?

Based on the above research questions the following null hypothesis is formulated.

H0: There is no relationship between collaborative dialogue and request making ability.

1.5. Definitions of Key Terms

The following study adopts the following definitions for its key terms:

**Pragmatics**: It focuses on the use of language in particular situations. It intends to explain how factors that are outside of language (what people mean by their utterances rather than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean) contribute to both literal and nonlinear meanings which speakers communicate using language (Fasold & Conner-Linton, 2006).

**Speech acts**: A speech act is an utterance that serves a function in communication. Speaking a language is performing speech acts, acts such as making statements, giving commands, asking questions, making requests, making promises… these speech acts are the basic or minimal units of linguistic communication (Searle, 1969).

**Collaborative dialogue**: As Swain and Lapkin (1998) have discussed, the concept of collaborative dialogue was extended from the output hypothesis (Swain, 1985; 1993; 1995). As Swain and Lapkin argue collaborative dialogue is a form of output, which is used for a cognitive function.

**Request**: Request can be defined as “attempts by the speakers to get the hearer to do something” or as “an illocutionary act whereby a speaker (requester) conveys to a hearer (requestee) that he/she wants the requestee to perform an act, which is for the benefit of the speaker” (Searle, 1976).
1.6. Limitations and Delimitations

In conducting any research there are some areas which are totally out of the researcher’s control. The following study also suffers from some inevitable limitations. The participants in this study were only 60 language learners, so the generalization of the results must be treated cautiously. Also learners were not familiar with the type of instructional activities used in this study and needed more time to get accustomed to the tasks in order to gain the full benefit from them. Another limitation of the present study is that only male learners were included in the study. There are some delimitations for the present study too. One of the delimitations of the present study is that the subjects of this study are confined to Iranian intermediate EFL learners. Another delimitation of this study is that it limits itself to investigating the effects of collaborative dialogue on request making skill. Another delimitation is that since there are many types of request and teaching all of them in a limited treatment time is impossible, this study limits itself to only some of them based on some sampling criterion.
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2.1. Introduction

A learner of English as a foreign language (EFL) needs at least two kinds of language competence for an effective communication with native speakers of the language: Linguistic competence and communicative competence. Linguistic competence, as defined by linguists, is the knowledge of the language system such as a structure, a vocabulary, and so on.

Communicative competence, suggested by Hymes (1972), is related to aspects rather than grammatical or linguistic knowledge, such as pragmatic competence. Hymes (1972) states that to achieve communicative goals, L2 learners must learn not only to speak accurately, but also appropriately (Hymes 1972, cited in Niroomand, 2011). One may conclude from Hymes’s claim that appropriacy is as important as accuracy for an efficient communication.

Bachman and Palmer’s (1996) model of communicative competence emphasizes on two major subcomponents of communicative ability: Language knowledge and strategic competence. Language knowledge includes organizational knowledge (i.e., grammatical and discourse knowledge) and pragmatic knowledge (i.e., functional and sociolinguistic knowledge). Strategic competence is a metacognitive component that embraces three areas of goal setting, assessment, and planning. Therefore, these subcomponents, namely organizational knowledge (grammar and discourse), pragmatic knowledge, and strategic competence, collectively are engaged in the effectiveness of L2 pragmatic performance.
2.2. Pragmatics

Pragmatics as a subfield of linguistics and semiotics is concerned with the study of the way meaning is communicated, comprehended, and interpreted by speakers and listeners with its contribution in the context. Morris (1938) gave the first definition of pragmatics as “the study of the relation of signs to interpreters” (p. 6). Since Morris’ definition of pragmatics came out of the semiotics point of view, three subsequent definitions of linguistic pragmatics were presented. They are provided below:

Pragmatics is the study of language from the point of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction, and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication (Crystal, 1985, p. 240).

Linguistic pragmatics (from Greek, activity, deed) is the study of communication principles to which people adhere when they interact rationally and efficiently in social contexts. Speakers/writers follow these principles to imply the additional meaning of a sentence.

Pragmatics is the study of the relations between language and context that are grammaticalized or encoded in the structure of language. Levinson (1983) also stated that pragmatic is the study of the relation between language and context based on an account of language understanding.

These three conspicuous definitions described pragmatics in a way that encompasses a whole range of pragmatics and can be accounted as a starting point of this study. Crystal (1985) on the definition of pragmatics put emphasis on not only the actual use of language, but also on encoding and decoding language by speakers and listeners. Bublitz’s (2001) definition
is very similar to Crystal’s (1985) but the inclusion of underlying notion that there are principles which speakers adhere to when communicating efficiently and rationally makes it a bit different. Finally, Levinson’s (1983) definition explicitly mentions the significant role of context which has a major role in the comprehension and interpretation of each utterance.

The emergence of communicative competence models (e.g., Bachman, 1990; Bachman & Palmer, 1996; Canale & Swain, 1980) changed the view of L2 learning from the mastery of grammatical forms to the acquisition of functional and social use of these forms. Since then, pragmatic competence, the ability to communicate and interpret meaning in social interactions, has become a crucial component of L2 proficiency distinct from grammatical, discourse, and strategic competences (Taguchi, 2011). Perhaps now a days the most widely used definition of pragmatics is found in the relationship between pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics. Pragmalinguistics refers to the linguistic resources which are necessary to perform language functions, and sociopragmatics refers to the language user’s assessment of the context in which such resources are executed (Leech, 1983).

Pragmatic development involves the acquisition of both of these knowledge bases, as well as efficient control of them in real time communication. For example, learners need to know what syntactic forms and lexis they should use in order to request from someone. At the same time they need to decide whether such request is acceptable within a particular situation in the target culture and if so, what to say in order to request and under what circumstances. Therefore, pragmatics is beyond grammar and includes knowledge of forms, as well as functional possibilities, and contextual necessities that determine the form that is needed (Taguchi, 2011).
2.3. Speech Acts

Interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) deals with how people use language within a social context (Gass & Selinker, 2008). Researchers working in the area of ILP have investigated the utterances of speakers in terms of interactional acts and speech acts. Interactional acts are concerned with discourse. It means how the speakers control the process of turn taking, opening and closing conversations, and sequencing acts. On the other hand, speech acts refer to the way language users perform specific actions especially interpersonal functions such as compliments, requests, apologies, complaints, and refusals. Of course, speech acts cannot be performed outside interaction and are interactional acts as well (Ellis, 2008).

Many of the studies in ILP have been conducted within the framework of speech acts which can also be seen as functions of language (Gass & Selinker, 2008). On the basis of speech act theory, speech is not just a means for describing the world and giving the information but also it is a form of action, that is, by producing an utterance one performs an action which consists of three related acts (Collavin, 2011): locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts.

Locutionary act refers to producing and uttering a meaningful linguistic expression. Illocutionary act or illocutionary force deals with the function of the utterance or a particular language function performed by an utterance, i.e., what the speaker intends to do things with words. Perlocutionary act or perlocutionary force is a speech act that produces an effect by saying something (Austin, 1962). An utterance, here, is treated as the realization of a speaker’s intention and goal in a particular context (Achiba, 2003).

In spite of the existence of the above mentioned three acts, the term “speech act” is mostly interpreted in its narrow sense to only refer to the illocutionary force of an utterance.
(Yule, 1996). Different realizations of speech acts which are related to different cultures may result in miscommunication and misunderstanding. Not only the linguistic realization of the speech acts is different, but also its force and pragmatic aspect is different. For example, in some cultures refusing an offer may need the use of more hedging before the actual refusal than it is needed in American culture (Gass, 1995).

Thus, in using speech acts attention should be given to both socioculturally and sociolinguistically appropriate behavior. Sociocultural ability refers to the skill of speakers in selecting strategies that are appropriate, regarding the culture, age and sex of interlocutors, and their social class and social status in interaction. Sociolinguistic ability refers to selecting appropriate linguistic forms in conveying the intended meaning (Cohen, 1995).

2.3.1. Direct vs. indirect speech acts. Most of the time what is meant by an utterance is not actually in the words uttered, but is implied in the meaning. This is when an indirect speech act is being used (Cutting, 2002). Whenever there is a direct relationship between the form and the function of an utterance, the speech act is a direct one. An indirect speech act is when the form of an utterance is not related to the function of speech act. It means that one speech act is performed by means of another speech act (Yule, 1996). For instance, the function of requesting someone to close the window can be performed in a direct or an indirect form. “Close the window, please.” is the direct form while, “Isn’t it cold in here?” is the indirect request in the form of a question.

2.3.2. Refusals. Refusals take place in the form of responses to a variety of speech acts such as invitations, offers, suggestions, and requests. Although they occur in all languages, not all languages refuse in the same way using the same strategies, nor do they feel comfortable refusing the same invitation or suggestion (Gass & Selinker, 2008). A high level of pragmatics
is needed in performing refusals because they are face-threatening acts and need to be lessoned by the speaker (Ellis, 2008).

2.3.3. Apology. An apology requires the speaker to admit responsibility for some behavior (or failure to carry out some behavior) that has proved costly to the behavior. Therefore, it is viewed as a face-saving fact. Apologies are imposed on the speaker rather than hearer, and also, they refer to past events (Ellis, 2008).

2.3.4. Request. The terms ‘request’ and ‘directive’ also have been inconsistently employed in empirical studies. Some researchers equate requests with directives and use the terms interchangeably. For instance, Ervin-Tripp (1976; 1977) makes use of a label of ‘directives’ and divides them into six types: Need statements, imperatives, embedded imperatives, permission directives, question directives, and hints. Her classification has been widely used in the studies of L1 children’s requests. Gordon and Ervin-Tripp (1984) adopt the same classification system but use the term ‘request’ instead of ‘directive’. Wolfson (1989) cites the classification of Ervin-Tripp and equates directives with requests. Although many researchers observe ‘requests’ as a subtype of ‘directives’ (e.g. Andersen, 1978; James, 1978; Schmidt, 1983), yet others see ‘directives’ as a subtype of ‘requests’ and define directives as requests for action (e.g. Read & Cherry, 1978; McTear, 1980). A broader definition of requests is provided by Becker (1982):

… ‘request’ refers inclusively to an utterance that is intended to indicate the speaker’s desire to regulate the behavior of the listener – that is, to get the listener to do something (Becker, 1982, p. 1).

According to this definition, what Searle (1976) has described as a ‘directive’ is called a ‘request’. On the other hand, Becker (1982) recommends that a request is more common and
less manipulative when compared with the term directive. Searle (1976) defines requests as ‘attempts by the speakers to get the hearer to do something’ (p. 11).

2.4. Pragmatic Form of Social Constructivism

Collaborative learning is related to social constructivist philosophy. Not all users who use the term collaborative learning refer to social constructivism, but increasing numbers of people in academia have begun to use this term to refer to constructivism (Oxford, 1997). Now social constructivism is viewed from different points of view:

2.4.1. Dewey’s (1932) pragmatic form of social constructivism. An American philosopher, John Dewey, a social constructivist (although the term constructivism was not yet in vogue during his lifetime), developed a pragmatic/instrumentalist approach (Oxford, 1997). Based on Dewey’s (1932) view, learners do not learn in isolation rather they learn by being part of the surrounding community and the world as a whole. Dewey offered a triangular relationship for the social construction of ideas among the individual, the community, and the world (Oxford, 1997).

Dewey (1932) believed that ideas become meaningful merely if they are (a) part of an acceptable theory, (b) instrumentally useful for creating positive action, (c) constructed by participants in society, (d) related to the guideposts or reference points provided by society. According to Dewey’s view, a disciplined reflective inquiry that is promoted by a community of learners (i.e., the knowledge community) help them create meaning among seemingly unstable events. Many of the modern publications about L2 teaching and learning made references to Dewey’s ideas such as reflective learning, reflective teaching, and communities of scholars or learners (Richards & Lockhart, 1994).
Dewey (1932) preferred to arrange content around broad content-rich ideas rather than around smaller problems or projects. Then, he was mistakenly viewed as doing project work in the classroom but in fact he did not believe in discrete projects unconnected to major themes. In modern thematic instruction, covering themes such as family, friendship, power, emotions, health, technology, etc., are found in most of innovative L2 textbooks. Dewey’s concept of content-rich ideas or themes reflect this type of instruction as filtered through various L2 instructional concepts such as functional-notional teaching and proficiency-based instruction (Nyikos & Hashimoto, 1997).

2.4.2. Vygotsky’s (1978) social constructivist ideas. A Russian psychologist, Lev Vygotsky, is significantly known as a social constructivist. Vygotsky (1978) like Dewey (1932) claimed that ideas have social origins that is, they are constructed through communication with others (Oxford, 1997). A cognitive system of an individual is a result of communication in social groups and cannot be separated from social life (Vygotsky, 1978; 1986). Vygotsky (1978) like Dewey (1932) points out that the individuals became powerful when they work in groups (Donato, 1994; John-Steiner, 1985; Lantolf, 1993).

Vygotsky (1978) believes that the teacher acts as a facilitator and the provider of assistance. Teachers carry out a lot of services to students by helping them develop their language and cultural skills. Vygotsky’s idea of assistance in the L2 classroom might include a hint or clue, a suggestion, a strategy for learning, a grammatical point, an intense review or anything that a particular L2 student needs at a given time. Whenever the learner needs the greatest help, scaffolding is given by the teacher to ensure that the learner’s constructs will continue to grow stronger and more complex. As the learner requires less help, the teacher tries
to remove the scaffolding to let the learners become increasingly self-directed and self-empowered (Oxford, 1997).

The concept of the zone of proximal development (ZPD) refers to “the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86). Lantolf (1993) highlighted that the ZPD is negotiated between the teacher and the student or between the student and peers or others.

2.4.3. Recent social constructivist contributions. Other social constructivist concepts are related to context and situated cognition. The context (i.e., setting and activity) in which knowledge is developed cannot be separated from learning (e.g., Lave & Wenger, 1991; Rogoff & Lave, 1984). Learning is situated and located within a given text. Learning occurs when people participate in the sociocultural activities in their learning community, transforming their understanding and responsibilities as they participate.

Social constructivists focus on the learning process rather than just performing the projects in activity-based situations with meaningful purposes. The students become acculturated, enculturated, or reacculturated which means that they got familiar with a particular learning culture or environment through classroom activities and through the modeling and coaching of the teacher and many others (Bruffee, 1993). Not only the teacher but also learner dyad or many other people can provide the scaffolding that the student needs.

2.5. Social Constructivism and Collaborative Learning

The process of learning L2 is taken place in a particular social context that becomes part of the culture of the learning community. Classroom is the immediate, accessible learning
community for the L2 learners. For instance, an Australian or North American or British learners of Spanish find a learning community in the Spanish language classroom. However, learning community of the L2 learners can and should also extend beyond the classroom.

L2 learning can be a global adventure that includes learning, understanding, and identifying another culture in which people use a different language, possibly in a completely different part of the world. American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL, 1995) focuses on the cultural aspects of language learning. Few other fields are as culture-oriented in the Deweyan sense as the field of L2 learning and teaching. The L2 teacher acts as a representative of the target language rather than just as a participant in the culture of the classroom. In the unilingual contexts where the target language is considered as a foreign language, the teacher might be the central and the only direct contact through which the language learner has access to the target language (Oxford, 1997).

Cultural and linguistic ideas in the community of L2 learners are constructed through reflective inquiry with other people like teachers, peers, native speakers, etc., who help the learner negotiate his or her own ZPD that is the distance between what they can achieve on their own and what with the help of others. These people provide scaffolding that is multiple forms of assistance that can be eliminated when the learner becomes more proficient in the culture and language in a learning community (Scarcella & Oxford, 1992).

Therefore, the basis of collaborative learning in the L2 classroom is social constructivism. Collaborative learning is more concerned with acculturation into the learning community and more explicitly oriented to negotiating and fulfilling the ability of each L2 learners.
2.6. Peer-peer Interaction from a Sociocultural Perspective

Generally it is believed that learning within ZPD is considered to happen in the expert-novice dialogue interaction in which an expert (usually a parent or a teacher) supplies dependent and graduated help to a novice (a child or a learner) (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994). However, these days there is a great attention in expanding the scope of ZPD to peer-peer interaction in L2 acquisition. According to Lantolf (2000), ZPD is ‘more appropriately conceived as the collaborative constructions of opportunities for individuals to develop their abilities’ (p. 17). A lot of studies (e.g., Donato, 1994; Foster & Ohta, 2005; Ohta, 2000; Storch, 2002; 2003) have conducted to examine how language learners help each other within their ZPD.

Peer-peer interaction in traditional interactionist approach was an activity in which learners negotiate meaning when communicating with each other for mutual understanding. Language development is the result of comprehensible input (Krashen, 1985) and comprehensible output (Swain, 1985) that is facilitated by negotiation of meaning (Long, 1996). Therefore, interactionist approach tries to “enable learners to move beyond their current receptive and productive capacities when they need to understand unfamiliar language input or when they are required to produce a comprehensible message” (Kumuravadivelu, 2006, p. 69). It is obvious that interaction causes a form-meaning relation in the interactionist approach. This approach has considered a minor role for interaction in language learning which considered knowledge as only a cognitive construct and that can only be transmitted from one person to another (Swain, 2000; 2001b). The social role of interaction among peers has also been ignored.
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چکیده:
سطح پایین اگاهی زبان آموزان زبان دوم نسبت به کاربردشناسی، اخیراً پژوهشگران را به وارد کردن آموزش کاربردشناسی در کلاس‌های بین‌کاری زبان تشکیل کرده است. پژوهش حاضر قصد دارد نقش گفتگوی مشترک را بر مهارت در خواست کردن بررسی نماید. بدین منظور، آزمون مهارت و مکالمه با عنوان پیش از امور 60 زبان آموز سری به ارائه بوده است. بر اساس نتایج آزمون مهارت، شرکت کنندگان به دو گروه آزمایشی (گروه مشترک همگن و گروه مشترک ناهمگن) و یک گروه کنترل طبقه بندي شدند. گروه های آزمایشی به صورت جفتی در طول شش جلسه آموزش اطلاعات صریح فراکاربردشناسی درمورد در خواست کردن را به همراه مکالمه دریافت کرده حرفه کنترل یا به صورت جدایی انجام دادند. نتایج حاصل از تحلیل و بررسی یک طرفه پیشرفته قابل توجهی را در مهارت در خواست کردن برای هر دو گروه آزمایشی نشان داد. آزمون تعیینی شده هم نشان داد که گروه مشترک همگن نسبت به گروه مشترک ناهمگن عملکرد بهتری داشتند.
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