



The Effects of Input-Based and Output-Based Practice on Pragmatic Development of Making Requests among Thai EFL Learners

Phattraporn Chotnok¹ and Chomraj Patanasorn²

^{1,2} Program English, Faculty of Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

^{1,2} Khon Kaen University, Thailand

¹E-mail: phattraporn.chtnk@gmail.com

Abstract

Input versus output has been the centre of debate of second language research since the 1980s. No one would disagree that input is a necessity for language acquisition; however, output has been viewed by some to be less important in the acquisition process. For example, VanPatten (2004) argues that output is merely a reflection of what has been acquired and that output practice deals more with developing fluency. Swain (2005), on the other hand, argues that input alone is not sufficient and suggests that output practice affords other opportunities that are important for acquisition such as hypothesis testing and receiving feedback. It could be argued that certain language knowledge and skills could benefit more from output practice than input practice. Pragmatic skills, for instance, involves the knowledge of using language appropriately in different contexts. To acquire such knowledge, it may be more beneficial to practice using language in different contexts than receive input of it. Thus, the purpose of this study is to compare the effects between input-based and output-based practice on the acquisition of pragmatic knowledge and skill, namely making requests. Participant were 30 students studying in Matthayom 5 in Nakhon Ratchasima, who divided into two groups, including an input-based practice group and output-based practice group. Both groups were given a pretest on the use of making requests prior to the treatment. Afterwards, they were provided two different treatments. Both were given explicit instruction of making requests, but the input-based practice group engaged in acceptability judgment task while the output-based practice group performed practice discourse completion task. The week after the treatment, the posttest will be administered immediately. The tests consisted of acceptability judgment test and discourse completion test. The results and discussion of the results along with their implications will be presented.

Keywords: English Language Teaching, Input-Based Practice, Making Requests, Output-Based Practice, Pragmatic Development

บทคัดย่อ

การรับเข้าและการออกใช้เป็นประเด็นถกเถียงในการวิจัยเกี่ยวกับภาษาที่สองตั้งแต่คริสต์ศักราช 1980 ไม่มีใครไม่เห็นด้วยว่าการรับเข้าเป็นสิ่งจำเป็นในการได้มาด้านภาษา อย่างไรก็ตามนักวิจัยเห็นว่าการออกใช้มีความสำคัญน้อยกว่าการรับเข้าในกระบวนการได้มาด้านภาษา เช่น แวนแพทเทิน (2004) ได้แย้งว่าการออกใช้เป็นเพียงการสะท้อนสิ่งที่ได้มา และการฝึกปฏิบัติโดยการออกใช้นั้นช่วยในการพัฒนาความคล่องแคล่วมากกว่า ในทางตรงกันข้าม สเวน (2005) ได้แย้งว่าการรับเข้าอย่างเดียวไม่เพียงพอและเขาแนะนำว่าการฝึกปฏิบัติโดยการออกใช้ช่วยให้มีโอกาสสำคัญในการได้มาด้านภาษา เช่น การทดสอบสมมติฐานและการได้รับผลสะท้อนกลับ ความรู้และทักษะทางด้านภาษาบางอย่างในการฝึกปฏิบัติโดยการออกใช้มีประโยชน์มากกว่าการฝึกโดยการรับเข้า ทักษะด้านวจนปฏิบัติเกี่ยวข้องกับการใช้ความรู้ด้านภาษาในบริบทที่แตกต่างอย่างเหมาะสม ในการได้มาความรู้ นั้น การฝึกปฏิบัติใช้ภาษาในบริบทที่แตกต่างอาจจะมีประโยชน์มากกว่าการรับเข้า ดังนั้นวิจัยฉบับนี้ มีจุดประสงค์เปรียบเทียบผลระหว่างการฝึกปฏิบัติโดยการรับเข้าเป็นฐานและการออกใช้เป็นฐานในการได้มาความรู้และทักษะด้านวจนปฏิบัติในการขอร้อง ผู้มีส่วนร่วมคือนักเรียนชั้นมัธยมศึกษาปีที่ 5 จากสถานศึกษาแห่งหนึ่งในจังหวัดนครราชสีมา นักเรียนถูกแบ่งออกเป็น 2 กลุ่ม ได้แก่ กลุ่มฝึกปฏิบัติโดยการรับเข้าเป็นฐานและกลุ่มฝึกปฏิบัติโดยการออกใช้เป็นฐาน ทั้งสองกลุ่มทดสอบการใช้การขอร้องก่อนการฝึกปฏิบัติ หลังจากนั้นพวกเขาได้รับการฝึก 2 กิจกรรมที่ต่างกัน ทั้งสองกลุ่มได้รับการเรียนแบบขัดแย้งการขอร้อง กลุ่มการฝึกปฏิบัติโดยการรับเข้าเป็นฐานจะฝึกปฏิบัติกิจกรรมการตัดสินใจยอมรับได้ ขณะที่กลุ่มฝึกปฏิบัติโดยการออกใช้เป็นฐานฝึกปฏิบัติการเติมบทสนทนา สัปดาห์หลังจากการฝึกปฏิบัติ นักเรียนจะเข้าร่วมการทดสอบหลังเรียนทดแทน การทดสอบประกอบด้วย การทดสอบการตัดสินใจยอมรับได้และการเติมบทสนทนา ผลการวิจัยจะถูกนำเสนอต่อมา



1. Introduction

Pragmatics has become significant in the area of second language acquisition. The relevance of pragmatics is related to teaching and learning of language for communication. Students were encouraged to perform language in the real social context use appropriately. Choudhury (2016) said that teaching English should not just to give learners knowledge about language, but it should enhance their ability to use language in the real life situations.

The basic learning content of language included vocabulary forms, a set of grammatical patterns, pronunciation as well as understanding of stories and cultural diversity of the world community (the Ministry of Education, 2008). Also, communicative learning of English were also designed in curriculum (Stevens, 1992). According to Gombert (1992), students can memorize rules and structures, but they cannot master the use of English language. They always fail to use English in communication. Noom-ura (2013) mentioned that Thai students were in the rank of very low proficiency of English even though they have been required to study English for twelve years in the basic education. As a result, linguistic knowledge is insufficient for the ability to communicate in English. As Eslami-Raskh (2005) and Meier (1997) showed that linguistic knowledge does not guarantee communicative efficiency and Bardovi-Harlig (2001) claimed that grammatical development does not guarantee pragmatic development. Speech act is one of the popular target structure to conduct the studies on the effects of pragmatics. Previous studies showed that speech acts are effective to develop students' pragmatic knowledge. However, researchers have still questioned the most effective instructional approach in teaching pragmatics has been questioned.

Over the past decades, empirical studies have paid so much attention to instructional approaches in teaching second and foreign language for EFL/ESL learners. The exposure to input-based and output-based approaches have received substantial attention in language instruction. They have been a controversial issue in Second Language Acquisition. VanPatten and DeKeyser describe the different points of view based on processing form-meaning connections between input and output hypothesizes. Some researchers believed that input alone is sufficient to bring changes in both learners' underlying knowledge and ability to produce a new structure (Krashen, 1982; VanPatten & Uludag, 2011). According to Krashen' Input Hypothesis (1981), this hypothesis was mentioned to answer the questions of how learning takes place and what mechanism exists to allow learners to move from one point to another. Based on this model, "learners process input for meaning before they process it for form" (VanPatten, 1993, 2004). On the other hand, Swain (1985) argued that input is inadequate to reach advanced levels of language development but output is also crucial to L2 acquisition and the development of L2 linguistic system (Swain, 1985, 1995, 1998, 2000, 2005). It has been seen as a way that learners practice their already-existing linguistic knowledge and create new linguistic knowledge. It is concerned with the practice in "production of target language" to promote the process of SLA. Moreover, cognitive psychologists emphasized that the role of practice transforms declarative knowledge into procedural knowledge. Learners are exposed to forms before they can access the language automatically through practice (Swain, 1993, Swain & Lapkin, 1995).

Input is claimed as a process which acquisition takes place, whereas output is claimed as a process to stimulate acquisition (Swain, 1998). Krashen (1982) believed that input alone is sufficient to bring changes in learner knowledge and learner behavior. In contrast, VanPatten (1996) and DeKeyser and Sokalski (1996) reported that output practice significantly developed merely production skills. VanPatten and Cadierno claimed that input practice affects skills on comprehension whereas output practice is beneficial for skills on production (1993a, 1993b). Besides, Ellis (1992, 1993), and VanPatten and Cadierno (1993) revealed that input practice brings



to acquisition whereas output practice helps to improve fluency. Nevertheless, Ellis (1997) revealed that no strong evidence to confirm that output is beneficial for L2 acquisition and no clear evidence that production practice can result in the acquisition of new linguistic form. Moreover, VanPatten assumed PI under input processing model can be seen as an approach to practically solve the difficulty when learners transform their underlying knowledge of input into output (2002a). Moreover, Izumi (2002) revealed that output promotes the facilitative impact on L2 acquisition by detecting the formal elements in the input. Output helps learners to integrate form and meaning and notice the problems between their interlanguage and input of the target language in communication. Buck (2006) presented that PI had altered the way input was processed and thus had an effect on the developing linguistic system. Learners could then access the intake accommodated in their linguistic system and thus produce the correct output.

Therefore, input and output both play the important roles in SLA, especially for teaching grammar. Nevertheless, there is a few studies focusing on pragmatic development. Which approaches are the most effective for L2 instruction on pragmatics has been a controversial issue among SLA. This present study aims to compare the effects of input-based and output-based practice on pragmatic developments of making requests among Thai EFL learners. The study addressed the following research questions:

1. Does input-based practice lead to the pragmatic development of making requests among Thai EFL learners?
2. Does output-based practice lead to the pragmatic development of making requests among Thai EFL learners?
3. Which type of practice is more effective leading to pragmatic development of making requests among Thai EFL learners between input-based practice and output-based practice?

Pragmatic Development

Pragmatics refers to the study of the use and processes of language in context. It first addresses the use of the language in context and know how language is used appropriately according to contextual factors (Canale, 1983; Rose & Kasper, 2001; Rajabia, Azizifara & Gowhary, 2015 as cited in Kasper, 1997). Pragmatic development was widely conducted over the past few decades in the area of second language acquisition, especially in English teaching. Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993) pointed out that researchers directed their attention to development the pragmatics in a second language. The amount of previous studies have shown that a wide range of pragmatics can be taught (Kasper, 1992; Kasper and Blum-Kulka, 1993; Schmidt, 1993). They have investigated on pragmatic gains over comprehension (e.g., Bouton, 1994; Kubota, 1995; Li 2012) and production (e.g., Bardovi-Harlig & Dörnyei, 1998; Bardovi-Harlig & Griffin, 2005; Soler & Hernández, 2017) in second language acquisition. However, the differences of the learners' first language and second language caused the inappropriate transfer of pragmatic knowledge from L1 to L2 (Takimoto, 2006). For instances, Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei (1998) revealed that non-native speaker (NNS) students were more aware of the utterances of incorrect grammar than inappropriate pragmatics as well as they would have less awareness on pragmatics. Often, NNS students were unable to produce pragmatically appropriate language when they interact both inside and outside the classroom (Halenko & Jones, 2011).

In the development of pragmatics, the speech act of requests is frequently used. Making requests is viewed as the strategies which they can enhance social relationship between people. The instruction of request speech acts enable learners know how to use language in real situation, so it seems to be useful for developing pragmatic awareness. Most previous studies of cross-cultural pragmatics used request speech act as a target structure to examine the effect of implicit



and explicit instruction in pragmatic teaching (Norris & Ortega, 2000; Rose & Ng, 2001; House, 1996). However, there was a few previous studies have focused on the role of input and output on pragmatic development.

Input – Based Practice

Conceptually, Input was defined as the language which the learner is exposed to both in the spoken and written forms (Corder, 1967). Since the 1980s, Krashen (1982) proposed Input Hypothesis as a central part of second language acquisition theory. He explained the processes of acquisition of the second language and how the learner can acquire the language. The process involves with how learners perceive language at the first stage and process linguistic data in the target language that they were exposed to by listening or reading. Initially, learners connect grammatical forms with their meanings and interpret the roles of forms and meanings (VanPatten, 1996, 2004). Besides that it is concerned with a process by which learners push input to intake (VanPatten, 2004). Thus, Krashen (1982) claimed that learners acquire language by understanding messages or by receiving ‘comprehensible input’. Later, VanPatten (1993) developed the model of Input Processing (IP). The process involves learners in processing input for meaning before form (VanPatten, 1996; DeKeyser, 2007). Based on this model, VanPatten (1993) described how learners make mistakes with grammatical markers in the language input. For instances, Buck (2006) claimed that learners acquired the correct form of the progressive but not its use because they have a limited capacity to process L2 information. Then, *Processing Instruction (PI)* was innovated as a practical solution of IP model to make better form-meaning connections. It was stated that it is a type of grammar instruction which focuses on meaning. VanPatten (2002) developed PI as a methodological approach to second language teaching in order to help learners in processing information via comprehension practice. PI is an input-based instructional approach which enhances L2 learning. It draws learners’ attention to the form of the target structure. After that, learners manipulate language input for meaning. Input-based instruction has been proved to be effective for helping learners to acquire accuracy and integrate the cognitive process into language. As a result, input-based practice can be effective in promoting L2 grammar and pragmatic development.

For instances, Tokimoto (2007) studied the relative effectiveness of structured input tasks with explicit information, problems-solving task; and structured input tasks without explicit information for teaching English polite request forms on pragmatic proficiency. The results showed that all three input processing tasks work effectively when learners were emphasized on the target structure with the features of pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic.

Later, Tokimoto (2009) investigated the effectiveness of the three types of input-based instruction including comprehension-based instruction, structured input instruction, and consciousness-raising instruction according to the method of assessment in L2 pragmatics. The study focused the forms of English requests on teaching lexical/phrasal and syntactic downgraders. The study showed that three types input-based tasks were effective in teaching pragmatics when forms and meanings were emphasized in an EFL context. In addition, the results indicated that the three type of input-based instruction tasks have similar effects on the in developing pragmatic proficiency. Moreover, the results of this study also were consistent with Takimoto (2006). That is, manipulating input in the consciousness-raising task was effective and has the effects on the L2 pragmatic proficiency development. Furthermore, learners developed their knowledge on comprehension and production.

In addition, Li (2012) examined the effects of input-based practice of requests in second language on pragmatic development. Participants were engaged in a regular training group and an



intensive training group. They were required to practice in making four forms of Chinese requests via computerized structured input activities including a listening judgment task on pragmatics and an oral discourse complete task. The control group did not attend any sessions for practice. The results revealed that the input-based practice functions effectively in promoting accuracy in an oral discourse completion task and speed was enhanced in a pragmatic listening judgment task.

Nevertheless, some researchers claimed that input alone might not be enough for L2 development, output has also been realized to be important in the process of second language acquisition.

Output – Based Practice

Output also plays an important role in the field of second language acquisition. Output Hypothesis had originally been proposed by Swain in 1985. She claimed that “output stimulate language acquisition by pushing learners to move from semantic processing to syntactic processing in comprehension to the complete grammatical processing needed for accurate production” (Swain, 1985). Output Hypothesis was stated as the action of producing language including speaking and writing. It was regarded as a way to practice already existing knowledge and create knowledge. Also, it was a way to elicit additional input. In addition, comprehensible output or pushed output was necessary to make learners understand the language by assisting them to move to the process of production (1985, p.249). The notion of output was moreover mentioned that when a learner encounters a gap in his or her linguistic knowledge, learning will take place. Thus, output indicates the outcome of what the student has learned.

Swain (1995) identifies the specific roles of output in language-learning. Firstly, Learners may be encouraged to notice the problems between their interlanguage and the target language, and recognize some of their linguistic problems when they encounter problems with the means to communicate their message in noticing function. Secondly, hypothesis formulation and testing are processes to express the intended meaning. Learners convey their intended messages by using their output as a way to practice new language forms (Swain, 1998). They may gain feedback from their L2 production both direct and indirect metalinguistic information, and they are able to test their hypotheses against feedback from their external resources or internal knowledge. Finally, the third function is metalinguistic function. Swain (1995, 1998) states that learners’ language production can reflect on the use of their own target language, or it is termed ‘metatalk’ which it enables learners be aware of forms and linguistic rules. It also assist learners understand the relationship between meaning, forms and function. Moreover, metalinguistic function serves a function to promote syntactic processing. Finally, de Bot (1996), Ellis (1992, 1993), VanPattern and Cadierno (1993), and VanPattern and Oikkenon (1996) point out that output practice also serves a role to improve fluency, and the automaticity of particular linguistic knowledge processing. Gass (1997) emphasize that the consistent output practice leads to the automatic processing of grammar. At this stage, it enhances fluency through practice of particular linguistic knowledge by turning declarative knowledge into procedural knowledge and improves learners’ speed of delivering messages.

DeKeyser (2007) discussed that output practice is necessary in skill acquisition for developing L2 proficiency. Learners are exposed to forms before they can access the language automatically through practice. He indicated that output is essential for integrating new linguistic representations into the exiting knowledge. It may be developmentally useful because it plays the role in promoting the awareness of form and encouraging leaners to pay attention to grammar in the target language (Schmidt, 1995, 2001). Moreover, the activities used in output practice are



generally designed for developing abilities to communicate in second language via speaking and writing tasks which the activities provide the opportunities to L2 learners in producing output.

Therefore, the models of production are fundamental to investigate the roles of output practice and determine how to construct output practice. The amount of previous studies have explored the roles and different functions of output in the area of second language learning (Abadikha & Zarrabi, 2011). Still, it has been questioned which kind of output practice is required in developing skills in production and how second L2 learners can engage in communication appropriately with other speakers in real situations. For instances, Abadikhah and Zarrabi (2011) explored the effect of an output task on learning verbal morphemes from Iranian EFL learners. They mainly aimed to investigate output tasks of verbal morphemes on comprehension and production and promote learning of the target linguistic forms. The result showed that there is a significant difference between learners' scores on comprehension and production tests. Learners who engaged in the output task had gain the score on posttest better than learners in the control group. The result in the posttest revealed that the output group had a significant gain of the target form in their productive knowledge. In addition, the result of this study is consistent with Swain's (1985) hypothesis that input alone is not adequate for acquisition. Providing learner with comprehensible input or existing comprehended input might not result in automatic learning of the form in the input. It was also claimed that the practice of output task has the positive effects on productive skills when learners have the chance to produce output in a meaningful way. It promotes learners' abilities in production on verbal morphemes. Moreover, it has a positive effect in long term. Nine months after the beginning of the study, learners improved the accuracy in their use of the target form. Furthermore, Abadikhah and Zarrabi implied that text reconstruct task can be used in English classroom as a supplementary activity. The task can engage learners in syntactic processing deeply when learners pay their attention to grammatical forms of the target language while focus them on content at the same time.

Although the role of input-based practice and output-based practice has been on the issue of debate in L2 teaching. They both are important in second language acquisition. Input alone was claimed to be insufficient to bring changes in both learners' underlying knowledge and ability to produce a new structure (Krashen, 1982; VanPatten & Uludag, 2011). Output is crucial for L2 learners to practice already-existing knowledge and creating new linguistic knowledge. Nevertheless, there were not many studies compared the effects of input-based and output-based approaches. For instances, Morgan-Short and Bowden (2006) explored the effects of processing instruction and meaningful output-based practice on SLA from 51 Spanish students. They aimed to investigate and compare the development of PI and MOBI in performance on interpretation and production. The target structures were Spanish direct object pronouns. Participants were students who took Spanish course in the first semester at a northeastern university. They were assigned to a processing instruction, meaningful output-based instruction and control group. The results revealed that PI and MOBI have a significant effect on linguistic performance. Learners improved their performance on interpretation and production of Spanish direct object pronouns after engaging in PI and MOBI. However, MOBI performed better than PI on the production tasks because of the effect from the output practice task that they received. Morgan-Short and Bowden (2006) assumed that input directly affects acquisition while output might have the indirect effect on linguistic development. Moreover, they indicated that both input- and output-based practice can have the direct effects in promoting linguistic development as well as acquisition through form-meaning connections.

A few years ago, Zhang (2013) examined and compared the different effectiveness of input-based activities and output-based activities on L2 Chinese learners' performance on



comprehension and production tests. Participants were 41 undergraduate students at a state university in New England Area in the United States. The Chinese adverb is the target structure. Participants were divided into three groups including input-based experimental group, output-based experimental group and control group. All three treatment group received the explanation of meaning and usage of the target structure. For input-based group, learners engaged in three activities. Firstly, learners were given a statement or dialogue to read and then asked to answer the question. Secondly, learners listened to a statement and then were asked to answer a question. Finally, learners received Chinese statements in writing and then they were asked to translate them into English. For output-based activities, learners also engaged in three activities. Firstly, they were given a context and then asked to complete the dialogue using the target form. Secondly, they received a context, and then they were asked to make a statement based on the context. Finally, they received English statements in writing and then they were asked to translate into Chinese. For the control group, learners did not involve in any interactive activities. Then, learners were required to take pre-test, immediate post-test and delayed post-test. Tests consists of two sections including comprehension and production. Comprehension included listening comprehension items, reading comprehension items, and translation items whereas production included completing dialogue, forming statements and translations. The results showed that both experimental groups better gains in L2 learners' performances on comprehension and production. Both groups share the same effectiveness on comprehension while output-based activities lead to greater gains in production.

2. Method

2.1 Research Design

Participants were thirty students studying in Matthayom-5 at Banmaiwittayakom School in Nakhon Ratchasima in the first semester of 2018 academic year. Participants were divided into two instructional groups including an input-based practice group (N = 15) and output-based practice group (N = 15). The present study took place in June. The study focused on request speech act. Both groups received handouts on target structure. The study focused on the input-based practice and output-based practice on the pragmatic development of making requests among Thai EFL learners. The speech act of requests was chosen as the target structure in teaching pragmatics for participants. The instructional treatment was conducted two times. Each teaching session lasted fifty minutes. Participants in input- and output-based groups received the explicit explanation of the target structure from the researcher who was an English teacher. Prior to the instruction, the pretest was administered the first week of June. During the instructional treatments, students in the input-based practice and output-based practice groups were required to engage in different kinds of activities on the target structure. The input-based group practiced the requests by engaging in acceptability judgment task whereas output-based group engaging in discourse completion task. After instructional treatments, the posttest was administered immediately. Both pretest and posttest consisted of acceptability judgment test and discourse completion test. The present study adopted and designed multi tasks and testing instruments based on previous studies as conducted by Tokimoto's studies (2006, 2007, and 2009). To compare the scores from pretest to posttest and between groups, dependent t-test in SPSS was used to analyze the data.

2.2 Research Materials

The handout with a brief summary of the request structure was provided based on the requesting strategies proposed by Blum-Kulka and Olshain (1989) including Direct strategies, Conventionally indirect strategies, and Nonconventional indirect strategies as well as examples on the target structure. The tasks and tests are designed based on Tokimoto's studies (2006, 2007,



2009). The study adopted the situations about student life in and outside school and some situations based on Sattar and Farnia (2014), Halenko and Jones (2011), and Jan, Lin and Li (2015).

All situations used for input-based groups combine sociolinguistic variables including social status ((+) = higher status and (=) = equal status), social distance ((+) not familiar with interlocutor or stranger, (-) = familiar with interlocutor) and degree of imposition ((+) = high difficulty, (-) = low difficulty). The participants were placed the role of a student making a request.

For input-based practice group, the materials in acceptability judgment task provided twenty situations with pictures and short description in Thai. Students were required to look at the pictures and read the descriptions in Thai. After that they practiced to indicate the appropriate level of each given request on the 5-point Likert scale. For output-based practice group, there were twenty situations used for practicing discourse completion task. The materials provided the pictures with descriptions written in Thai of each situation and some situations were designed by adapting sending the messages via social network channels such as Line chatting and e-mail.

For pretest and posttest, there were ten situations in the acceptability judgment test provided the pictures with short descriptions in Thai as well as three request items for each situations (a, b, and c). For discourse completion task, the picture with Thai description and dialogues were given in each situation. Then, students are required to complete the dialogue by filling in a request for each situation.

2.3 Instructional treatments

At the beginning of the lesson, the handout describing language form of requests and examples of the target structures was provided to students in both input- and output-based practice group. Both groups received the explicit explanation of request structures from the researcher. The researcher explained the request forms and how to make and use requests in Thai as well as provides the potential situations of the target structures' form and some examples on request speech act in both English and Thai and. After the explanation, the students in input-based practice group engaged in acceptability judgment tasks. Students were required to read the given request from each situation and indicate the level of appropriateness of a request form that was underlined in each situation on a 5-point Likert scale based on their pragmatic background knowledge. For output-based practice group, students involved in discourse completion activity. They were required to complete the dialogue by writing a possible request sentence about what they would say for that situation in English. The researcher monitored and might give them some feedback.

2.4 Data Analysis

Acceptability Judgement Test

The acceptability judgment test consisted of ten situations. Each situation provided the description written in Thai and the picture. Also, three requests written in English (a, b, c), and a 5-point Likert scale of each request were given for each situation. Students were required to read the descriptions and indicate the level of appropriateness of each item. After that, they must rearrange the given requests from the least to the most appropriate request of that situation. Finally, students' results were compared with English native speakers. 5 points were given when the three request items are in the same order as English native speakers. 3 points were given when two request items match the English native speakers' answer. 1 point was given if one request item matches English native speakers' answer. If the answers are not in the same order as English native speakers, they would not receive scores. The maximum score is sixty (10×5).



Discourse Completion Test

For discourse completion test, the test consisted of ten situations. Students were required to read the descriptions written in Thai and the dialogues in English. Then, they were asked to complete the contexts by fill in an English request that they would say in each situation. Their responses were scored by a native speaker based on the rubrics of the pragmatic appropriateness and the accurate grammatical production of requests. According to the scoring rubrics proposed by Li (2012), the production of each request was scored as the following: 4 points for a pragmatically appropriate and grammatically accurate sentence, 3 points for a pragmatically appropriate and grammatically incorrect sentence, 2 points for a pragmatically inappropriate and grammatically accurate sentence, 1 point for a pragmatically inappropriate and grammatical inaccurate sentence and a zero for no response. The test contains ten items and the maximum score is 40 based on a native speaker (10×4).

2.5 Statistical analysis

SPSS program will be used as a tool to analyze the statistical data. Dependent T-test will be used to compare the significance between pretest and posttest. One-way ANOVA will be used to compare the significance between three groups.

2.6 Reliability

Interrater reliability of rating of acceptability judgment test was measured based on two native speakers' baseline in order to reflect the learners' ability to recognize and judge the appropriateness in making requests in real situations. In addition, learners will be scored their responses of discourse completion test in order to measure their abilities to produce and perform making requests appropriately according to the scoring rubrics by a native speaker.

2.7 Validity

To promote content validity, the test items match the theoretical framework which they are outlined based on the degree of social context variables including social status, social distance and imposition. Moreover, test items are examining by two native speakers.

3. Results

The present study aimed to investigate the effects of input-based and output-based practice on pragmatic developments of making requests among Thai EFL learners. SPSS was used to perform the statistical analysis in order to answer the research questions 1) whether input-based practice lead to the pragmatic development of making requests among Thai EFL learners, 2) whether output-based practice lead to the pragmatic development of making requests among Thai EFL learners, 3) which type of practice is more effective leading to pragmatic development of making requests among Thai EFL learners between input-based practice and output-based practice. An alpha level was set (*p value* = .05). The results are presented in tables below.



Table 1. Results from acceptability judgment test

Test			Mean	SD	df	t	sig.
Acceptability Judgment Test	Input Group	Pretest	20.40	10.494	14	-	.002
		Posttest	29.47	6.885	14	3.893	
	Output Group	Pretest	17.87	6.390	14	-	.021
		Posttest	24.27	7.478	14	2.595	

To answer research question one whether input-based practice lead to the pragmatic development of making requests among Thai EFL learners, the results from acceptability judgment test were showed in table 1. The results from dependent t-test displayed the gain scored of input-based practice group that the mean in pretest was 20.40 and posttest was 29.47. There was a significant difference from pretest to posttest among input-based practice group ($p=.002$). For the output-based practice group, there was also a statically significant gain in posttest ($p=.021$). The mean score in pretest was 17.87 and in posttest was 24.27.

Table 2. Results from discourse completion test

Test			Mean	SD	df	t	sig.
Discourse Completion Test	Input Group	Pretest	19.33	11.204	14	-	.000
		Posttest	34.00	4.520	14	4.628	
	Output Group	Pretest	23.47	9.819	14	-	.001
		Posttest	34.07	3.595	14	4.023	

To answer research question two whether output-based practice lead to the pragmatic development of making requests among Thai EFL learners, the results from discourse completion test were presented in table 2. Both groups performed better in posttest. The results revealed that input-based practice group gained 19.33 mean score in pretest and 34.00 in posttest. There was a significant different ($p=.000$). The output-based practice group also had a better gain in posttest. The mean score in pretest was 23.47 and in posttest was 34.07. The difference was significant ($p=.001$).

Table 3. Results between input- and output-based practice groups

Test		F	Sig.	Mean	SD	df	t	sig.(2-tailed)
Acceptability Judgment	Input Group	.055	.816	29.47	6.885	28.000	1.981	.057
	Output Group			24.27	7.478	27.811	1.981	.058
Discourse Completion	Input Group	.313	.580	34.00	4.520	28.000	.045	.965
	Output Group			34.07	3.595	26.651	.045	.965



To answer research question three which type of practice is more effective leading to pragmatic development of making requests among Thai EFL learners between input-based practice and output-based practice, the findings were presented in table 3. The results revealed that there were no statistically significant differences among the two groups both in acceptability judgment test and discourse completion test, $p=.816$ and $.580$, respectively.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

The present study aimed to compare the effects between input-based and output-based practice on the acquisition of pragmatic knowledge of making requests among Thai EFL learners. The first research question was does input-based practice lead to the pragmatic development of making requests among Thai EFL learners? The results indicate that input-based practice improve learners' pragmatic knowledge after the exposure to requests. In acceptability judgment test, input-based group improve their scores in the posttest when they received the explanation on pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic knowledge. Most of students considered to make requests in an indirect way as the most appropriate. For example, the situation was that a student is carrying a big pile of book and her hands are full, she cannot open the door so she asks a teacher who is passing the room to open it for her. Most students tended to indicate "could you please open the door for me?" more appropriate than "open the door for me, please" and "I would like you to open the door for me". The results showed that students were able to judge the appropriateness of requests when they can access the meaning. Students improved their knowledge how to use requests appropriately in the context. As a result, input-based practice leads them to perform better on comprehension. Also, output-based group gained better marks on the posttest after they received the explicit instruction of requests.

To answer research question two, does output-based practice lead to the pragmatic development of making requests among Thai EFL learners? The results indicate that output-based practice leads students to better scores in the posttest on the production of requests. The output-based group improved their performance on production after they received the explicit instruction of requests and practice in discourse completion task. Many students were able to produce requests grammatically and pragmatically. Students mostly tended to make requests in an indirect way. For instances, the situation was to ask a teacher permission to submit homework after the due date, many of them made a request by beginning with *could, may, can or would* (e.g. could I submit my homework after class?). In addition, some made requests in a direct way (e.g. I would like to have wifi code please.), and in an imperative form (e.g. please tell me the time.). Also, input-based group attained better scores on the posttest after the exposure to the target form.

Finally, the third research question was which type of practice is more effective leading to pragmatic development of making requests among Thai EFL learners between input-based practice and output-based practice. The results showed that there were no statistically significant differences among the input-based group and output-based group. Students were able to improve their pragmatic knowledge after they were exposed to the explicit instruction of requests. Although students in input- and output-based groups were required to practice in different tasks, they could attain better scores in posttest on both acceptability judgment test and discourse completion test. The results were correspondent with VanPatten and Cadierno (1993a, 1993b) and Tokimoto (2009). Input-based practice leads students to better performance on comprehension to judge the level of appropriateness of request based on their background knowledge and output-based practice leads them to production. Thus, the both input- and output-based practice can be effective to lead EFL learners to pragmatic development of making requests.



The present study aimed to compare the effects between input-based and output-based practice on the acquisition of pragmatic knowledge of making requests among Thai EFL learners. Both input-based practice and output-based practice of making requests were effective to bring change on learners' pragmatic knowledge. Students developed their performance on comprehension and production of pragmatics. Nevertheless, it can be assumed that the improved performances resulted from the practice of the target structure after the explicit instruction. The results indicated that the practice acceptability judgment task and discourse completion task have the similar effects on learners' pragmatic development. Thus, the further study will investigate the effect of input- and output-based practice on pragmatic development of making requests on role-play task. Finally, the present study was limited with the amount of participants because of the school context. The study will be beneficial for teaching pragmatics for EFL learners.

5. References

- Abadikhah, S. & Zarrabi, F. (2011). The effect of output tasks on the acquisition of English verbal morphemes. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(11). 1549-1560.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics. In R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.). *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 13-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. & Griffin, R. (2005). L2 pragmatic awareness: Evidence from the ESL classroom. *System*, 33, 401-415.
- Blum-Kula, S. & Olshtain, E. (1989). Requests and apologies: A Cross-Cultural study of speech act realization pattern (CCSARP).
- Bouton, L. (1994). Can NNS skill in interpreting implicatures in American English be improved through explicit instruction? In L. Bouton & Y. Kachru (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (pp. 88-109). Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois.
- Buck, M. (2006). The effects of processing instruction on the acquisition of English progressive aspect. *Estudios de Lingüística Aplicada*, 24(43), 77-95.
- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds). *Language and communication*. London: Longman.
- Choudhury, J. Z. (2016). Teaching Effectiveness of Native and Non-Native EFL Teacher as Perceived by Preparatory Year Students in Saudi Context. *Language in India*. 16, 98-121.
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 5, 161-170.
- De Bot, K. (1996). The psycholinguistics of the output hypothesis. *Language Learning*, 46, 3, 529-555.
- DeKeyser, R. M. & Sokalski, K. J. (1996). The differential role of comprehension and production. *Language Learning*, 46, 613-642.
- DeKeyser, R. M. (2007). Introduction: Situating the concept of practice. In R. DeKeyser (Ed.). *Practice in a second language: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology* (1-13). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1992). *Second language acquisition and language pedagogy*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Ellis, R. (1993). The structural syllabus and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 91-113.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *SLA research and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eslami-Raskh, Z. (2005). Raising the pragmatic awareness of language learners. *ELT Journal*, 59(3), 199-208.



- Gass, S. (1997). *Input, Interaction, and the second language learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gombert, E. J. (1992). *Metalinguistic development*. Hamel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Halenko, N. & Jones, C. (2011). Teaching pragmatic awareness of spoken requests to Chinese EAP learners in the UK: Is explicit instruction effective? *ScienceDirect*, 36, 240-250.
- House, J. (1996). Developing pragmatic fluency in English as a foreign language: Routines and metapragmatics awareness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18, 225-252.
- Izumi, S. (2002). Output, input enhancement, and the noticing hypothesis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24, 541-577.
- Kasper, G. & Blum-Kulla, S. (1993). Interlanguage pragmatics: An introduction. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulla (Eds.) *Interlanguage Pragmatics* (pp. 3-17). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kasper, G. (1997). Can pragmatic competence be taught? *NFLRC Network*, 6, 1-13.
- Kasper, G. (1992). *Pragmatic transfer*. *Second Language Research*, 8(3), 203-231.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Li, S. (2012). The effects of input-based practice on pragmatic development of requests in L2 Chinese. *Language Learning*, 62(2), 403-438.
- Meier, A. J. (1997). Teaching the universals politeness. *ELT Journal*, 51(1), 21-28.
- Morgan-Short, K. & Bowden, H. W. (2006). Processing instruction and meaningful output-based instruction: Effects on second language development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 31-65.
- Noom-ura, S. (2013). English-teaching problems in Thailand and Thai teachers' professional development needs. *English language teaching*, 6(11), 139-147.
- Norris, J. & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 50(3), 417-528.
- Rajabia, S., Azizifara, A., & Gowhary, H. (2015). The effect of explicit instruction on pragmatic competence development; teaching requests to EFL learners of English. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199, 231-239.
- Rose, K.R. & Ng, C. (2001). Inductive and deductive approaches to teaching compliments and compliment responses. In R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in Language Teaching* (pp. 145-170). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, K.R. & Kasper, G. (2001). *Pragmatic and language teaching*. Cambridge, NY: CPU.
- Schmidt, R. W., & Richards, J. C. (1980). Speech acts and second language learning. *Applied linguistics*, 1(2), 129-157.
- 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*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Soler, E. A. & Hernández, A. S. (2017). Learning pragmatic routines during study abroad: A focus on proficiency and type of routine. *Journal of the Spanish Association of Anglo-American Studies*, 39(2), 191-210.
- Strevens, G. (1992). English as an international language: Directions in the 1990s. In B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (pp. 27-47). Chicago: University of Illinois.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (235-253). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.



- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook, & B. Seidhoffer (Eds.), *Principles & practice in linguistics: Studies in honor of H. G. Widdowson* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistic*, 16, 370-391.
- Swain, M. (1998). Focus on form through conscious reflection. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 64-81). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97-114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. (2005). The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 471-481). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- The Ministry of Education (2008). The basic education core. Thailand: Ministry of Education.
- Tokimoto, M. (2006). The effect of explicit feedback and form-meaning processing on the development of pragmatic proficiency in consciousness-raising tasks. *System*, 34, 601-614.
- Tokimoto, M. (2007). The effects of input-based tasks on the development of learners' pragmatic proficiency. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(1), 1-25.
- Tokimoto, M. (2009). Exploring the effects of input-based treatment and test on the development of learners' pragmatic proficiency. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41, 1029-1046.
- VanPatten, B. & Cadierno, T. (1993a). Explicit instruction and input processing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15(2), 225-243.
- VanPatten, B. & Cadierno, T. (1993b). Input processing and second language acquisition: A role for instruction. *Modern Language Journal*, 77, 45-57.
- VanPatten, B. (1993). Grammar teaching for the acquisition-rich classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 26, 435-450.
- VanPatten, B. (1996). *Input processing and grammar instruction in second language acquisition: Theory and research*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- VanPatten, B. & Oikkenon, S. (1996). Explanation versus structured input in processing instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18(4), 495-510.
- VanPatten, B. (2002). Processing instruction: An update. *Language Learning*, 52, 755-803.
- VanPatten, B. (2004). Input processing in second language acquisition. In B. VanPatten (Ed.), *Processing instruction: Theory, research and commentary* (pp. 5-32). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- VanPatten, B. & Uludag, O. (2011). Transfer of training and processing instruction: From input to output. *System*, 39, 44-53.
- Zhang, X. (2014). A comparative study of the effectiveness of input-based activities and output-based activities in the acquisition of Chinese language. *Master Theses*, 1-58.