# The Use of Pragmatics in E-mail Requests Made by Second Language Learners of English

Senka Majetić
*MA senior assistant*
*Department of English Language and Literature*
*University of Bihać*
*Luke Marjanovića, Bihać*
*Bosnia and Herzegovina*

_____

**ABSTRACT—** *The current paper provides results of a study that investigated the usage of pragmatics by non-native speakers (NNSs) of English when making e-mail requests. Initial data from the study shows that NNSs differ from native speakers (NSs) in politeness and perlocution (i.e., the effect that an utterance has on its recipient) of their English e-mail requests. The data also show that NNSs and NSs differ in the specific pragmatic strategies related to structure and content used in their e-mail requests. Additional data from this study indicates that explicit instruction can positively affect the perlocution of NNS e-mail requests and the long-term usage of pragmatics features found in the e-mail messages of NNSs, although the greatest effect is observed in the appropriate usage of structural features. The results of this study support the need for instruction of e-mail pragmatics to second language learners and reveal the possible benefits of such instruction. This finding suggests the need for more instruction on pragmatic strategies to increase the perlocution of e-mail requests and maintain it over time. One suggestion for doing this is to include CMC pragmatics as competency in the academic writing curriculum and to provide a more comprehensive pragmatic analysis to include several different types of speech acts, such as apology and information exchange, in addition to requests. By doing so, instructional time for e-mail pragmatics would be extended throughout the semester, giving students many opportunities to practice writing strategies that are becoming more useful, and even necessary, in academic settings.*

**Keywords—** e-mail request, pragmatics, perlocution, recipient.

_____

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Over the past decade, researchers have become increasingly interested in examining the usage of e-mail by second language learners. Early studies looked at the effective use of e-mail in instructional settings (Warschauer, 1995; St. John and Cash, 1995). Additional studies addressed the use of e-mail institutional settings, such as business (Inglis, 1998; Gaines, 1999) and academia (Gaines, 1999; Lan, 2000). More recently, researchers have directed their attention to the pragmatics of e-mail messages (Hartford and Bardovi-Harling, 1996; Weasnforth and Biesenbach-Lucas, 2000; Chen, 2001), although no attention to date has been paid to the instruction of e-mail pragmatics.

This study hopes to contribute to the body of research by reporting results of a study that examined the pragmatics of e-mail requests made by non-native speakers (NNSs) of English in an instructional setting. In the ensuing paper, I begin by providing a review of the literature most relevant to the current study. Afterwards, I describe the research methodology used during the project, including the participants, the study design, and data coding. Finally, I present and discuss some of the data gathered over the course of the research period, focusing on pragmatic differences NNSs and native speakers (NSs) of English, and the effects of instructing NNSs on the correct usage pragmatics in English.

### 1.1 Pragmatic Development and ESL

Numerous language researchers have looked into the development of pragmatics in a second language, particularly in English. A consistent theme across the various studies related to pragmatic development and ESL is that pragmatics can and should be thought: pragmatics *should* be thought because it does not appear to be easily transferable

from first language (L1) to second language (L2) (Kasper, 1992); pragmatics *should* be taught because this will raise awareness of appropriate language use, which has been shown to aid in language development (Schmidt, 1993); and pragmatics *can* be taught, as is evidenced by a number of studies of classroom language learning and instruction. Bardovi-Harling (2001) reached the same conclusions in her extensive review of the empirical evidence from research of L2 pragmatic production, judgment, perception, competence, and proficiency. This theme is essential to the overall conceptualization of my study and constitutes the theoretical foundation of this line of research.

Motivated by the initial research that examined interlanguage development, many in the field of interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) have applied the theories proposed by the previous SLA research to the instruction of pragmatics in the classroom setting. Several studies have focused on developing awareness of pragmatics through explicit instruction. Their results generally support the notion that pragmatic development can be enhanced through explicit awareness-raising technique. Many other studies have compared implicit and explicit instruction of pragmatics in the ESL setting. Takahashi (2001), Tateyame (2001), and Yoshimi (2001) each found explicit instruction of pragmatic features to have a greater effect on pragmatic competence than implicit instruction. In consideration of such positive findings from previous research, it appears that explicit instruction does in fact assist pragmatic development in second language learners. This conclusion provides further motivation and rationale for my study.

## 1.2 Requests and ESL

One of the most frequently occurring speech acts across cultures, and one of the most researched as well, is the request. Blum Kulka, House, and Kasper (1989) devoted a large portion of their edited volume to studying the pragmatics of the request speech act, through their research, they developed a process for designing appropriate data elicitation tests and created a detailed coding manual to assist in analyzing discourse data.

A number of researchers have investigated the performance of English requests by a specific cultural group: Kitao (1990) looked at Japanese learners of EFL, Trosborg (1995) studied Danish learners of EFL, Kim (1995) examined Korean learners of ESL. Each of these researchers found evidence of negative transfer of L1 pragmatics and concluded with the need for explicit instruction in making English requests. Kasange (1998) had the same findings in a study of ESL learners at an American university and found no evidence of negative L1 transfer of pragmatics with regards to the request speech act.

In quite a different approach to researching the pragmatics development of requesting in English, Li (2000) conducted an ethnographic case study of female ESL learner in workplace environment in Canada and found that her pragmatic development came about mainly through language socialization with coworkers.

An interesting investigation by Schmidt (1994) compared actual request data gathered at service counters to request lessons found in four popular ESL textbooks. Schmidt's results showed that textbooks were deficient in the range of real-world request types and the explanations of request types given.

Additional work in this area of pragmatics research has focused on the instruction of requests. Rose (1999) provided a report of the successful instruction of requests to students in Hong Kong using pragmatic consciousness-raising (PCR) techniques. Rose defines PCR as

> ...an inductive approach to developing awareness of how language forms are used appropriately in context. The aim is not to teach explicitly the various means of... performing a given speech act... but, rather, to expose learners to the pragmatic aspects of language... and provide them with the analytical tools they need to arrive at their own generalizations concerning contextuality appropriate language use. (Rose 1999:171)

With such a definition, Rose further explains that PCR is a process in which pragmatic awareness is raised first by introducing students to a particular pragmatic feature, then by activating students' L1 knowledge of the pragmatic feature, and finally by analyzing English data for the same pragmatic feature. Through such a process, students will become aware of „both the pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects of English" as they develop „analytic abilities that they can apply to future language learning" (Rose, 1999:180). This approach to raising pragmatic awareness will influence the treatment design of my study.

## 1.3 E-mail Pragmatics

With the development of the Internet, increased attention has been given to the use of pragmatics in computer-mediated communication (CMC). Since Shea (1994) first presented her principles of business „netiquette" (a bland of the words *network* and *etiquette*), which are basic rules and guidelines for behaving and interacting via CMC, several others (Hambridge, 1995; Rinaldi, 1998) have further developed and applied netiquette principles to the full range of possible CMC purposes, from formal (e.g., business e-mail, academic discussion boards) to informal (e.g., Internet „fun-club" chat rooms). At this point in time, netiquette guidelines have become conventionalized and are publicized wherever CMC may take place, from office settings to Internet cafés; they have even found their way into ESL textbooks (e.g., Swales and Feak, 1994; Hacker, 2003) and onto university writing web sites (e.g., Hughes, 2002; Essid, 2003).

The line of research most directly relevant to my study are the handful of reports that investigate the pragmatics of e-mail requests in ESL environment. Of particular interest to my study is the report by Hartford and Bardovi-Harling (1996), who analyzed for perlocutionary effect e-mail requests sent by NS and NNS graduate students to professors. They concluded that, in general, NNS e-mails did not adequately address imposition, which negatively affected perlocution (i.e., the effect that an utterance has on its recipient). In addition, NNS messages contained fewer downgraders and other mitigating supportive moves such as grounders and apologies, which negatively affected the impact of the requests. Weasenforth and Biesenbach-Lucas (2000) analyzed variation between graduate NSs and NNSs employed pragmatic strategies that negatively affected the perlocution of their English e-mail requests. Chen (2001) analyzed and compared e-mail requests sent by Taiwanese and U.S. graduate students to their professors. She concluded that the Taiwanese and U.S. students used different request strategies than the U.S. students due to culturally different perceptions of power relations, familiarity, and imposition. This study illuminates the possibility of divergent culture-specific pragmatic strategies employed by even advanced-level ESL students when making e-mail requests in the academic setting.

## 1.4 Instruction of E-mail Pragmatics

At this point in time, e-mail pragmatics in the ESL setting remains largely under-researched. While important groundwork has been done to investigate cross-cultural differences evident in e-mail pragmatics, the effects of instruction of e-mail pragmatics remains virtually untouched.

Consistent with the absence of research into the effect of instruction in e-mail pragmatics, there is also a shortage of pedagogical materials devoted to the systematic instruction of the pragmatics of e-mail communication in the ESL context. Various textbooks of academic writing for ESL students provide very brief sections on e-mail usage that focus primarily on formal and functional rules for the university setting. Probably the most comprehensive Internet site devoted to English writing, OWL at Purdue University (http://owl.english.purdue.edu), devotes minimal attention to e-mail pragmatics, and even then, it is targeted to NSs of English and provides no mention of miscommunications or violations that may arise due to cross-cultural differences in pragmatics (Hughes, 2002). However, on the bright side, Frod (2003), Mach and Ridder (2003), and Weasenforth (2003) each have developed lessons and materials devoted to issues of e-mail pragmatics in the ESL environment, particularly in academia.

## 2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Drawing from the preceding literature review, the following research questions guided the current study:
1)  Is there a difference between the perlocution of NS and NNS English e-mail requests?
2)  What are the differences between the pragmatic features of NS and NNS English e-mail requests?
3)  What are the effects of instruction to NNSs in the usage of appropriate pragmatic features when making e-mail requests?

## 3. MATERIAL AND METHOD

### 3.1 Participants

Over the course of the 2011-2012 academic year, I completed a study in which I investigated the usage of e-mails pragmatics. I conducted this study in my own two sections, the advanced-level writing course for undergraduate ESL students at the University of Bihać. My particular section met three days per week in 45-minute class sessions. Qualitatively, there seemed to be no differences between the two sections: they both met during the morning, they both contained approximately the same numbers of students, and they both utilized the same textbook and instructional materials.

Over the two semesters, I gathered complete data sets from a total of 15 NNS. Data from an additional 10 students were incomplete, missing at least one message each, and were therefore excluded from this study. However, in the following analysis and discussion section, I do not consider cultural differences in pragmatic usage, for cultural differences do not seem relevant at this stage in my analysis of effects of instruction.

At the beginning of each semester, these students indicated on a general course questionnaire that they frequently used computers and e-mail programs, and that they had never received any formal instruction in either computer or e-mail usage. Each of the students also supplied a valid e-mail address for the purposes of communication outside of classroom instruction time.

### 3.2 Research Design

Pre-test. The study relied on a quasi-experimented design on that included a pre-test, treatment, immediate post-test design. The pre-test was administered during the third week of each semester. It consisted of the following task:

*Write me an e-mail message asking me to extend the due date for a paper that's due soon. Provide me an adequate reason, and convince me that I should grant your request. Give me any other information that I should grant your request. Give me any other information that you think would help me accept your excuse. Send your message to me the day before our next class.*

My students were given this assignment in class and were told to complete the task before the next class meeting. They were provided with no additional instructions about the assignment.

When designing the prompt, I decided to have the students address a professor of a course under the assumption this may help the students become more personally connected to the prompt, which may result in a serious, well-thought-out message. Furthermore, I specified that the students should provide adequate reason and additional information, and use proper form and language because I wanted the students to understand that this was a real, serious assignment. The specify of the prompt was an attempt to ensure that the students would not submit a minimal message written a few minutes before class, but instead would submit a message written after careful thought and planning, as would be the case in real life if writing a request to a real professor.

Treatment. The very next class session was held in a campus computer lab. The students were presented with a lecture based on rules of netiquette via web site with the goal of understanding how netiquette guidelines will help to make e-mail messages more acceptable and effective. After a brief introduction to netiquette principles, we talked about how these principles could be applied to different CMC situations, particularly ones that the students could encounter in their academic careers. Next, the students examined examples of poorly constructed e-mail messages and ways to improve them, while reflecting of the netiquette guidelines. In doing so, aspects of perlocution and politeness were discussed rather cursorily. Lastly, students viewed additional web sites on the Internet devoted to netiquette, specifically Shea's (1994) „Netiqette" page, Rindali's (1998) „The Net: User Guidelines and Netiqette" page. This was done to raise further awareness of e-mail pragmatics as an issue that extends far beyond the classroom and computer lab and applied to the entire Internet community. This lesson filled the full 45 minute class period and constituted the entire treatment.

Post-test. As their homework assignment due before the next class session, students were required to resubmit their previous e-mail requests based on what they had learned from the netiquette lesson. This comprised the immediate post-test portion of the study. During the remainder of each semester, no classroom time or otherwise was spent on issues related to e-mail pragmatics. The delayed post-test was administered during finals week, a full 15 weeks after treatment. The task of the delayed post-test was a very similar assignment used for the pre- and immediate post-test. Also administered as a homework assignment. The assignment differed from the previous prompt only in that it asked students to request an extension of due date of the final course paper. This change was made in an attempt to make the assignment more realistic, since the delayed post-test was administered during finals week, when the students were actually thinking about these matters in their lives.

Data coding. After data was gathered, I coded each e-mail message onto a separate coding form that I developed, based on Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper (1989) and Shea (1994). Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper (1989) provide an elaborate coding scheme developed for the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) for analyzing requests. Following the CCSARP coding manual, analysis of requests includes three distinct stages: 1) identification of the *head act,* which is the minimum segment that constitutes the actual requests; 2) identification of non-essential elements that modify the head act internally; and 3) identification of non-essential elements relevant yet external

to the head act. Together these parts contribute to a thorough analysis of a given request. For purpose of my study, I combine the coding scheme of the CCSARP with required aspects of formal e-mail requests.

Additionally, the scope of the coding scheme was adjusted for the lengthier stream of discourse of the e-mail message that were gathered by the task-based performance assessment in the current study instead of the single utterances gathered by discourse completion task (DCTs), for which the CCSARP was originally designed. Therefore, the coding form has separate sections for recording the tracking number of the e-mail message, the length of the message, the formal features of netiquette found in the message and the request(s) found in the message, and overall ratings for perlocutionary effect and politeness level of the message.

The rating for perlocutionary effect is based on a 5-point scale ranging from least acceptable to most acceptable, and concerns the likelihood that the receiver would accept the request:

Rating Perlocutionary Effect-

1 Least Acceptable

2 Less Acceptable

3 Acceptable

4 More Acceptable

5 Most Acceptable

This 5-point scale was decided due to its ability to allow for comparisons and slight differences in ratings across messages, while at the same time allowing for manageable analysis. The scale requires making a holistic judgment about the acceptability of a message based on experience and pragmatic intuition. Factors affecting judgment include an adequately formed request, an appropriate level of politeness, and an adequate use of downgrades and positive supportive moves. At one end of the scale, a rating of „Least Acceptable" would indicate a high likelihood that the recipient of the message would not accept the request. At the center of the scale, a rating of „Acceptable" would indicate that the request in the message would probably be accepted by the recipient. At the other end of the scale, a rating of „Most Acceptable" would indicate a high likelihood that the recipient of the message would accept the request. As with the politeness rating scale, points 2 and 4 allow for slight differences in perlocutionary effect, depending on specific strategies employed in individual messages. The rating for politeness is based on a 5-point scale ranging from impolite to overly polite, and concerns the level of overall formality perceived by the receiver:

Rating- Politeness Level-

1 Very Impolite

2 Slightly Impolite

3 Polite

4 Too Polite

5 Overly Polite

This 5-point scale was decided for the same reason as the perlocutionary effect rating scale discussed previously. At one end of the scale, „Very Impolite" messages would be ones that are very brief and terse, are demanding, are insulting, or are otherwise perceived as rude. At the other end of the scale, „Overly Polite" messages would be ones that contain inappropriate uses of politeness markers, complements, or expressions of gratitude. At the center of the scale, „Polite" messages were those that follow netiquette guidelines by briefly stating a purpose, asking a request, providing only necessary details, and thanking the recipient, without discussing personal issues or qualities (Shea, 1994; Rinaldi, 1998). Points 2 and 4 allow for slight differences in politeness, depending on specific strategies employed in individual messages.

After collecting all of the study data, I coded and tarred each message, using the data coding from discussed previously. In the following data analysis, I focus on my coding and ratings of the data only.

## 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Throughout the course of the research project, I gathered a total of 74 e-mail requests for data analysis: 45 from the 15 NNSs in the form of pre-, immediate post-, and delayed post-tests, and 29 from the NSs as baseline data. Due to limited space, I will focus on my research questions.

*Is there a difference between the perlocution of NS and NNS English e-mail requests?*

Across the data set, NSs were rated on average just slightly above "acceptable" for perlocution, while NNSs were rated a full point below NSs in the "unacceptable" range, on their pre-test e-mail messages. Table 1 below shows descriptive statistics of the e-mail perlocution ratings.

**Table 1**: Descriptive Statistics for Perlocution

|  | **N** | **M** | **SD** | **MIN** | **MAX** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NS** | 29 | 3.14 | 0.74 | 2.00 | 4.00 |
| **NNS** | 15 | 2.20 | 0.68 | 1.00 | 3.00 |

This initial analysis shows that the NNSs tend to produce less acceptable English e-mail requests and it also confirms previous work by Hartford and Bardovi-Harling (1996) and Chen (2001) who had the same findings.

Examples 1 and 2 below are provided as representative of NS and NNS e-mail requests gathered for this study.

**Example 1:** NS e-mail request

**From** Native Speaker ns@yahoo.com

**To** majetic.senka@yahoo.com

**Subject** From a student in your class

Hi,

This is from Native Speaker, a student in your class. I am writing to you in regard to the paper due next Monday.

I would like to be given an extension until Wednesday if possible. On Sunday, I had to take my younger brother to the emergency room after he was injured playing football. We were at the hospital all day, and I wasn't able to finish my paper. I know your policy is not to grant extensions, but I was hoping you'd understand my circumstances. I couldn't foresee this emergency. I'd gladly supply you with supporting documentation. I understand you might not be able to do this, but if you could, I'd greatly appreciate it.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Native Speaker

**Example 2**: NNS e-mail request

**From** Non Native Speaker nns@yahoo.com

**To** majetic.senka@yahoo.com

**Subject**

Dear Ms.,

I have a request on the homework assignment that you assigned to us which must due on Monday. One of my close relative has gotten into a car accident yesterday night and she's in a critical condition. I was the only close relative that she has in

Bihać. Since I have to take care of her until she gets better, I have not enough time to do the assignment. Thus, could you extend the due date of that assignment, please? I have to apologize that I have such request; however, she really needs my help at this time. Please give me time to finish up.

Thank you very much!

Sincerely,

Your Student

Each of these examples was judged the same by two raters. Example 1 was rated "4- More Acceptable" for perlocution and "3- Polite" for politeness. Example 2 was rated "3- Acceptable" for perlocution and "4- Too Polite" for politeness. Although their ratings were similar, it is obvious that the pragmatic strategies employed in forming these two messages are quite different. To begin with, whereas the NS includes a subject in the subject field of the message, the NNS does not, which is a violation of netiquette guidelines. Secondly, whereas the NS proves identification, the NNS does not. This is also a violation of netiquette guidelines. Additionally, whereas the NS forms the request in a "preparatory – request statement – grounder" fashion, the NNS forms the request in a "preparatory – request statement – grounder – request question" fashion. This NS request pattern is the prototypical NS pattern found in the data set. Lastly, the NSS message contains politeness and upgrader features discussed in the following section, whereas the NS message does not. Altogether, these differences in pragmatic strategies contribute to the differences in ratings between the NS and NNS messages.

*What are the differences between the pragmatic features of NS and NNS e-mail requests?*

One of the most noticeable differences between the pragmatic features of NS and NNS e-mail requests has to do with level of politeness. Table 2 below shows descriptive statistics of the e-mail politeness ratings.

**Table 2:** Descriptive Statistic for Politeness

|  | N | M | SD | MIN | MAX |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NS | 29 | 3.07 | 0.65 | 2.00 | 4.00 |
| NNS | 45 | 3.42 | 0.78 | 2.00 | 5.00 |

NSs were rated just average overall for politeness – not impolite and not too polite. However, across all of the NNS messages (pre-test, post-test, and delayed post-test), they were rated above average for politeness by nearly a half of a point. This may not seem like much of a difference, but it does show that NNSs tend to produce e-mail requests that may be interpreted as too polite, a feature which may affect the perlocution of the message. Specific pragmatic features employed by the NNSs and not by the NSs, which may affect politeness, include complements, expressions of gratitude, and repeated uses of politeness markers (e.g., "please"). This finding is consistent with the research by Chen (2001) discussed previously, who, as a result, concluded that NNS over-politeness in e-mail requests is due to cultural transfer. This point should be considered for future instructional designs of e-mail pragmatics materials and lessons.

Another interesting finding regarding the differences between the pragmatic features of NS and NNS e-mail requests had to do with the use of upgraders in the e-mail messages. Upgraders are negative pragmatic devices that serve to increase the impact of the request and, therefore, may reduce the perlocution of the message. Following Netiquette guidelines (Shea, 1994; Hambridge, 1995; Rinaldi, 1998; Hughes, 2002, use of expletives, repetitions, exclamations points, time intensifiers, and all-capital letters are considered inappropriate features of formal e-mail messages and should be avoided. Within the entire NS data set, not one upgrader is used. On the other hand, NNSs make use of orthographic upgraders (exclamation points and all-capital letters) 11 times, three of them in one message alone. Examples of orthographic upgraders used by NNSs are "EMERGENCY!" found in the subject heading of one message, "Hi!" found in the introductions of several messages, as well as "Thank you!" found in the closing of several more messages. Additionally, several NNSs use time intensifiers such as "ASAP", and the repetition-of-request strategy, which also serve as message upgraders.

*What are the effects of instruction in the usage of appropriate pragmatic features when making e-mail requests?*

By analyzing the NNS pre-, immediate-post, and delayed-post-test messages, it is evident that there were positive effects on instruction maintained over time. Regarding perlocution of the e-mail requests, results of this analysis indicate that NNS messages increase in perlocution on the immediate-post-test, approaching "acceptable" on average. On the delayed-post-test, NNS messages maintain an increase in perlocution, although down from the immediate-post-test level and with no significance to the pre-test level.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The study investigated the usage of pragmatics by NNSs of English when making e-mail requests. The study contributes to the body of research in e-mail pragmatics by showing first that NSs and NNSs of English differ greatly in the pragmatic strategies that they use when making e-mail requests, and second that e-mail pragmatic features are teachable to NNSs. Findings from the study indicate that NNSs tend to produce messages that are rated as too polite, and at the same time are judged to have low perlocutionary effect. Additional findings suggest that explicit instruction in e-mail pragmatics has a positive effect on the perlocution of e-mail messages, including the use of certain structure features and content pragmatic features.

This study is very limited in scope, containing a small number of participants, and examining only few of the e-mail pragmatic features possible. However, it confirms in an instructional setting that e-mail pragmatics can and should consider ways to include the instruction of e-mail pragmatics in their curricula.

## 6. REFERENCES

Bardovi-Harling, K. (2001) Evaluating the empirical evidence: grounds for instruction in pragmatics? In K. Rose and G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., Kasper, G. (1989) *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies.* Norwood: Ablex Publishing.

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

Chen, C. F. E. (2001) *Making e-mail requests to professors.* St. Louis: Taiwanese vs. American Association for Applied Linguistics.

Hacker, D. (2003) *A Writer's Reference (5$^{th}$ ed.).* New York: St. Martin's.

Hall, J. K. (1999) The prosaic of interaction: The development of interactional competence in another language. In E. Hinkel (Eds.) *Culture in second language teaching and learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rinaldi, A. H. (1998) *The Net: User Guidelines and Netiquette.* Retrieved from http://www.fau.edu7netiquette/net/

Rose, K. R. (1999) Teachers and students learning about requests in Hong Kong. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Pragmatics in language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmidt, T. Y. (1994) *Netiquette.* The Internet: Albion Books. Retrieved from http://www.albion.com/netiquette/book/index.html

Takahasi, S. (2001) The role of input enhancement in developing pragmatic competence. In K. Rose and G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tateyama, Y. (2001) Explicit and implicit teaching of pragmatic routines: Japanese *sumimasen.* In K. Rose and G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trosborg, A. (1995) *Interlanguage pragmatics: requests, complaints, and apologies.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Warschauer, M. (1995) *E-mail for English teaching.* Alexandria: TESOL.