



A Corpus-Based Investigation of “Would You Like” and “Would You Mind” Request Expressions’ Collocational Patterns in American Spoken English Discourse

Reza Bagheri Nevisi^{1*}  & Fatemeh Miri² 

Abstract

Knowledge of speech acts and their functions are basic components of pragmatics and the request speech act plays a crucial part in everyday interactions. This study aimed to investigate whether native speakers of English make any differences utilizing the request expressions “would you like” and “would you mind”, their collocations in both spoken and academic contexts and the functional differences caused by the co-text. To this end, the data was retrieved from Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). The results revealed that such expressions in the spoken corpus were used more frequently in the transactional context with equal status and as interactional-oriented. However, in the academic corpus, the same expressions were used more frequently in the pedagogical context with the high-low status and as both interactional-oriented and task-oriented. The expression “would you like” was mostly used to give information, whereas “would you mind” was usually used to request an action. These expressions were not used for the purpose of imposition in any of the two contexts. The study revealed that the collocations didn't affect the function of such requests. In fact, it was the collocating words that changed due to the pragmatic functions and the objectives of the speakers. The findings might contribute to understanding of the variations which matter between the request expressions. Teachers and learners might gain insights into how and when they are used and which collocations are more frequent so as to focus more carefully on them and make informed and proper decisions within pedagogical settings.

Keywords: collocational patterns, pragmatics competence, pragmatic function, request expressions, speech acts

Received: 15 August 2021
Received in revised form: 30 September 2021
Accepted: 14 October 2021

^{1*} Corresponding Author: Associate Professor, Department of English Language and Literature, University of Qom, Qom, Iran; Email: re.bagheri@gmail.com,

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000000285828119>

² MA Department of English Language and Literature, University of Qom, Qom, Iran;

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000000257794871>

1. Introduction

Earlier studies have shown that pragmatics and grammatical competence of English Foreign Language learners do not grow hand in hand and that even grammatically competent EFL learners can inappropriately use language and deviate from pragmatic norms in their target language use (e.g., Birjandi & Derakhshan, 2014; Derakhshan, et al., 2020; Derakhshan & Eslami, 2019; Derakhshan & Shakki, 2021; Eslami-Rasekh, et al., 2004; Pishghadam, et al., 2021; Scarantino, 2017; Shakki, et al. 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023; Yu, 2008). When speakers learn a second language, they must learn more than just the vocabulary or grammar; they also must be aware of the target culture majority of second-and foreign language learners, and even those with professional grammar knowledge have trouble comprehending the speakers' intended meaning and conveying their correct intention through language (Aydin, 2012; Barekat & Mehri, 2013; Malmir & Taji, 2021; Pishghadam, et al., 2021; Shakki, 2022). The focus in EFL context is mostly upon linguistic competence while pragmatic competence is ignored (Salazar, 2007).

Given that the speech act of requesting is one of the most frequently-used in everyday interactions, learners should become conscious of the significance of requesting in communications (Liu, 2007). The problem might be enhanced for non-native speakers of English who usually do not make sense of some minor differences. Such phenomena should be only thoroughly explored in a corpus, whose pragmatic functions and lexical forms show a one-to-one relationship. For instance, this relationship is observable in the word "please", as it functions as a marker of politeness (Wichmann, 2004). The term "I don't know" is obvious, which is to suggest inconsistency and lack of knowledge (Diani, 2004; Tsui, 1991). The combination of corpus-discourse is practical as Hyland (2009) believes these pairs are two sides of the same coin of Applied Linguistics, as most forms of corpus search need a lexical hook to retrieve similar examples and allow for quantitative analysis (Adolphs, 2008; Reppen, 2010).

Where a complete form-function mismatch is noticeable, as in conversational implications, it justifies the necessities for a quantitative analysis to be carried out. Besides the lack of unity in form-function incongruities, the problem of employing identical words and their different forms (would you mind or would you like), which many speakers may not value so much, may make serious wrong choices. In Thomas (2006), this is called pragmatic failure as an unintended verbal behavior, and it is what Zamborlin (2007) named "pragmatic dissonance" involving any

(verbal) behavior that originates either intentionally or unconsciously and that appears to be unforeseen on the part of the hearer(s). The issue for non-native English speakers who naturally don't make sense of certain small variations may be intensified. To fill the above-mentioned gap, this study has selected two expressions of requests, i.e. "would you like" and "would you mind." In a number of cases, the use of the expressions "would you like" and "would you mind" as a means to request can vary. Examples are as follows:

1. *What would you like Michael's children to know about Michael as a father? (Asking others' opinions)*
2. *Would you like me to say? (Making a request)*
3. *What food would you like? (Asking others' opinions)*
4. *Would you like to rephrase that statement? (Offering an opinion)*

This study aims to investigate whether native speakers of English make any difference in utilizing these request expressions, their collocations and the functional differences caused by co-text. Accordingly, the following research questions were formulated:

- 1) What are the most frequent collocational patterns co-occurring with "would you like" and "would you mind" in spoken and academic context?
- 2) Are there any collocational differences between the use of "would you like" and "would you mind"?
- 3) Do the phrases that precede and follow "would you like" and "would you mind" influence its functions and vice versa?
- 4) What factors affect the choice of "would you like" and "would you mind"?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Pragmatics

Pragmatics encompasses the study of how utterance perception and performance rely on real-life knowledge; how learners employ and decode speech acts; and also, how sentence structure is affected by the connection among speaker and listener (Luo & Gao, 2011). It corroborates the fact that it is not sufficient to possess linguistic and lexical knowledge to be capable of using a foreign language. Thus, pragmatic and socio-pragmatic considerations contain significant features of performing a language appropriately (Sarac-Suzer, 2008). According to Triki

(2013), pragmatics particularly focuses on meanings of sentences not when they are employed alone but also as they are used in everyday interactions. The emphasis is on what speaker means by different linguistic choices not what the linguistic choice means by itself. Furthermore, pragmatics is more involved with the close correspondence between sentence meanings and speakers' intended meanings and more significantly, the real meaning of a sentence can be recognized by the analysis of context (Derakhshan & Shakki, 2020; Shakki et al., 2023). Leech (2014) also maintained that pragmatics is the analysis of the meanings of the sentences in various contexts. Zamborlin (2007) described pragmatic situations as situations where speakers perform the linguistic action that interlocutors distinguish against the conversation's harmonious stream. Besides, some perception of the rules of pragmatic in a language — the responsibility of the social context within the language components we choose — one cannot classify a language student as having communicative competence in the L2.

2.2. Corpus

Corpus linguistics is receiving an incomparable focus in Applied Linguistics and further paths to meet the needs of applied linguistics and language learners are paved (Stubbs, 2007). The unparalleled relation between form and function has caused many debates between linguistics or corpus linguistics aspects. Stubbs (2007) maintains that a word could not be interpreted well in the text alone. It is also required to analyze the text, its production and how it is perceived in real discourse. Hyland (2009) holds that the solution is pairing corpora and discourse approaches. He believes these pairs are two sides of the same coin of Applied Linguistics.

One salient area of research in this regard is the research of speech acts in written or spoken corpora, as Adolphs (2008) asserts it caused a paradigm shift in representation of languages. Furthermore, Rühlemann (2010) states that corpus linguistics greatly influences the contribution to theory construction and speech acts. He asserts that analyzing corpora has indicated that some concepts in speech acts may require to be reassessed. Those concepts could be investigated in a corpus which their pragmatic functions and lexical forms show a one-to-one relationship. The word “please”, for instance, serves as one of the markers of politeness (Wichmann, 2004).

Following larger-scale definitions and requestive analyses, some of the latest corpus-based requestive studies concerned several smaller corpora with finely tuned analysis. Some work has been centered, for example, on different genres or contexts in which requests play an important role. Camiciottoli (2009) investigated requests for data during phone calls of the financial earnings that occurred in question and answer to conversations, Macaulay (2001) focused on media interviews, Partington (2003) analyzed requests in the White House press report. The ease of learning written forms for such occurrences of high-density requests makes them a reasonable starting point for a corpus-based requests analysis. They are, however, unique speech events (particularly the phone calls for financial earnings), in which a very limited percentage of speakers actually participate. It is therefore necessary to also carry out a detailed review of requests in normal conversations at work, at home and in conversation with friends in everyday contexts. Vine (2009) probed into interactions in New Zealand in an office setting, noting in particular the contextual variables that went hand in hand with imperatives and modal interrogations (can/could /would you). She concluded that an important role in determining the variety of the forms employed was on social power and distance, the variations in linguistic forms, were not specifically taken into account. She suggested that the interaction goal (problem solving) influenced all types, like the purpose of the directives and the frequency. She also contended usage patterns while analyzing the setting of the discourse, suggesting that there were imperatives 1) at the end of a long discussion, 2) when there were many activities, 3) when the request was explicitly elicited; and 4) co-occurring with NOW instructions (request for spontaneous action). On the other hand, as Vine (2009) pointed out that more amplified constructions (such as modal interrogatives) occur in isolated contexts when there is a high amount of imposition and when a distinct approach has been proposed. Therefore, it is entirely possible to match the requestive constructs with the setting that they are to occur most likely, which indicates the opposite. Furthermore, Vine (2009) pointed to the importance of thoroughly examining contextual variables other than social distance and social power, including the meaning of interactions and the context of discourse.

Having studied the literature, it can be discerned that linguistic and sociocognitive elements have remained imprecise, leading to differences in the usage of certain words. What makes this work worth doing, in fact, is the focus on patterns of collocation that co-occur with the expressions "would you like" and

"would you mind" and clarifying their discoursal and lexical features. These two expressions are chosen because they are more common among the most common request speech acts, and they can also be used interchangeably. Many studies have so far worked on the methods by which speakers produce the act of apologizing in general (Bataineh & Bataineh, 2006), social class variations (Holmes, 1990), age-related variations (Andersen, 2001), as well as gender-based discrepancies (Ogiermann, 2008) in the use of apologies. No work has been carried out to the best of the researchers' knowledge of the functions, co-textual environment or linguistic distribution of the request expressions "would you like" and "would you mind" in one single study.

3. Method

3.1. Research Design

The study is a corpus-based one as it counts the frequency of the expressions "would you mind" and "would you like" and analyzes the collocational patterns co-occurring with these expressions based on seven coding categories in the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). These coding categories are type of request (action, information), context types (intimate, socio-cultural, professional, pedagogical or transactional), speakers (parent / child, teacher / student, friends), level of social power relations (low-high, high-low or equal), interactional request (conversing to maintain a relationship for social purpose), task-related request (collaborating on a task), and imposition. These are the features that occur in the context of request expressions and influence the production of the expressions and how interlocutors use them in different settings. The theoretical framework which is an eclectic one found in earlier request studies (Adolphs, 2008; Blum-Kulka et al., 1989; Curl & Drew, 2008) was adopted to analyze the collocational patterns co-occurring with request expressions "would you mind" and "would you like."

3.2. Corpus Criteria and Selection

Five corpus requirements were defined before agreeing on corpora to investigate in order to choose corpora that would have valid data: spoken and academic, naturally occurring, contemporary, interactional, and North American English (mainly U.S. speakers). These corpora requirements are part of the corpus design chosen for this research. For the selected corpus in this research, the primary criterion was for the

data to be interactional. In other words, requests are found almost entirely in dialogues and only corpora of spoken language were studied. As the major variation between the syntax of written and spoken English has been well documented (Leech 2000), this research focused solely on spoken conversational language. Moreover, this spoken part was compared to the dialogues used in the academic section to answer the research questions properly. Third, naturally-occurring spoken data was utilized. Fourth, only spoken language corpus with contemporary data was included from no earlier than 2000. Eventually, the speech of North American English speakers from the United States was mainly used.

To embark upon the analysis of request expressions "would you mind" and "would you like" in American English spoken discourse, the researchers needed to compile corpora. The data was retrieved from Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). The rationale behind the selection of this corpus was three-fold. First, the research was based on American English and this corpus was the best fit for this purpose. Second, the raw data in this corpus was accessible without any charge. Third, the classifications of the corpus focused primarily on speech events and speech acts which were essential in the analysis of research questions.

3.3. Corpus

To conduct the study, the researchers derived data from a major corpus: Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). An online data compilation was carried out. The broad corpus of American English is the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). COCA is perhaps the most commonly-used English corpus and offers unprecedented insight into English varieties. The corpus comprises over one billion words of text (20 million words per year from 1990-2019). The COCA corpus from 2000 to 2019 was thoroughly investigated.

The corpus presents significant metadata on the setting of conversations and information of speaker, including age, gender, occupation, and relationship with others, and transcripts, which can be downloaded from the internet free of charge. It has the benefit of a large number of close and socio-cultural discussions that are difficult to obtain from spoken conversational data. COCA can be reached at url: <https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/>

3.4. Data Collection Procedure

First, data was compiled from the corpus. According to Evert in the article of Corpora and Collocations (2007), "It is not uncommon to find more than a million recurrent word pairs ($f > 2$) in a corpus containing several hundred million running words, but only a small proportion of them will pass a frequency threshold of $f > 10$ or higher, as a consequence of Zipf's law". Thus, to make the study feasible, the researchers adopted the frequency of $f > 10$ or higher. The data, then, was converted to Word files to be appropriate for in-depth analysis. The theoretical framework which is an eclectic one found in earlier request studies (Adolphs, 2008; Blum-Kulka et al., 1989; Curl & Drew 2008) was adopted to analyze the collocational patterns co-occurring with request expressions "would you mind" and "would you like". These features were coded in a Microsoft office Word. The first column was associated with the retrieved texts from the corpus. From the second column on, the columns were allocated to the seven coding categories. Interactional and task-related requests were illustrated in one column. The last column was dedicated to collocation words.

4. Results

4.1. The Most Frequent Patterns of Collocation Co-occurring with "Would You Like" and "Would You Mind" in Spoken and Academic Context

The first research question addressed the collocational patterns which co-occurred with request expressions "would you like" and "would you mind". Tables 1, 2 & 3 demonstrate the collocation patterns and their frequencies.

Table 2
Would You Like, Academic Context

Expressions / academic	Frequency
Would you like + of	15
Would you like + how	20
Would you like + what	33
Would you like + to	86
Would you like + see	12

Table 1
Would You Mind, Spoken Context

Expressions / spoken	Frequency
Would you mind + if	19
Would you mind + me	19
Would you mind + us	10
Would you mind + for	10
Would you mind + I	16
Would you mind + that	13
Would you mind + just	10

Table 3
Would You Like, Spoken Context

Expressions / spoken	Frequency
Would you like + him	41
Would you like + me	66
Would you like + who	28
Would you like + hear	22
Would you like + he	27
Would you like + so	28
Would you like + now	24
Would you like + well	16
Would you like + I	45
Would you like + Mr.	11
Would you like + right	19
Would you like + and	64
Would you like + where	21
Would you like + no	10
Would you like + with	29
Would you like + try	14
Would you like + do	74
Would you like + say	61
Would you like + happen	34
Would you like + hear	19
Would you like + 's	28
Would you like + see	91
Would you like + but	20
Would you like + get	18
Would you like + all	15
Would you like + at	14
Would you like + our	14
Would you like + president	18
Would you like + go	39
Would you like + take	31
Would you like + respond	12
Would you like + they	12
Would you like + up	10
Would you like + have	43
Would you like + is	17
Would you like + come	23
Would you like + one	14
Would you like + ok	11
Would you like + just	10
Would you like + tell	12
Would you like + be	87
Would you like + yes	18
Would you like + to	853
Would you like + there	12
Would you like + some	38
Would you like + us	29
Would you like + what	322
Would you like + said	47
Would you like + it	93
Would you like + my	18
Would you like + ask	31
Would you like + people	14
Would you like + for	45
Would you like + on	36
Would you like + plus	14
Would you like + in	60
Would you like + start	10
Would you like + when	10
Would you like + from	22
Would you like + them	23
Would you like + kind	10
Would you like + 'm	10

4.2. Collocational Differences between the Use of “Would You Like” and “Would You Mind”

The second question of the study addressed the problem of collocational variations in the use of "would you like" and "would you mind." The request expression "would you like" occurred more frequently in the spoken context; 2882 times with 62 different words. The same expression in the academic context occurred 164 times with only 5 different words. The request expression "would you mind" in the spoken context occurred 107 times with 8 different words. However, in the academic context there was no collocation for this expression.

The expression "would you like" in the spoken corpus mostly occurred with the words: "to, what, it, and see." The expression "would you like" in the academic corpus mostly occurred with the words: "to, what, and how." The expression "would you mind" in the spoken corpus mostly occurred with the words: "if, me, and I." The "would you mind" request expression was less common than "would you like" and since collocations with a frequency of 10 and the spin of 5 were investigated, "would you mind" request expression mostly occurred in the spoken corpus and was not frequent in the academic corpus at all. Two of the most frequent words were "what and to" which collocated more frequently with "would you like" in both academic and spoken contexts.

4.3. The Effect of Phrases that Precede and Follow “Would You Like” and “Would You Mind” on their Functions

The third question dealt with the mutual effects between "would you like" and "would you mind" and their functions in the accompanying co-text. Obvious distinctions among diverse functions were challenging to make. It was the semantic meaning which indicated various pragmatic functions of the expressions. While the context was examined, it became clear that it was the semantic meaning of the context which influenced and changed the function of the two request expressions. Thus, functions did not change because of the collocations. The functions mostly did not change because of the neighboring words, but they changed because of the semantic and the speakers' intended meaning. It is the speaker who intends to make only a suggestion or a request for an action. The analyses illustrated that most instances of "would you like" and "would you mind" were used as a means of presenting a polite offer, making a request, asking others' opinions, asking for an advice, or offering an opinion.

4.4. Factors Affecting the Choice of "Would You Like" and "Would You Mind"

As Table 4 indicates the total number of occurrences of "Would you like" in the spoken corpus was 2882.

Table 4
Context Type, Would You Like, Spoken Context

	Context Type				
	Intimate	Sociocultural	Professional	Pedagogical	Transactional
Frequency	82	360	201	20	2219

In the context type section, there were intimate, sociocultural, pedagogical, professional, and transactional contexts. The expression "would you like" in the spoken corpus occurred more frequently in the transactional context with a total number of 2219 occurrences accounting for 76% of all the occurrences. It also occurred in the sociocultural, professional, intimate, and pedagogical contexts with 360, 201, 82, and 20 occurrences respectively. Most of the expressions ask for a particular action from a listener, where social status is not equal between the two, as it is called transactional which means two individuals are collaborating on a common subject.

Table 5
Type of Request, Would You Like, Spoken Context

	Request Type	
	Action	Information
Frequency	474	2408

In the type of request section, the expression "would you like" in the spoken corpus occurred more frequently in the information or suggestion context with a total number of 2408 occurrences accounting for 83% of all the occurrences. It also occurred in request for an action with 474 occurrences.

Table 6
Social Power, Would You Like, Spoken Context

	Social Power		
	High-low	Low-high	Equal
Frequency	354	749	1779

The expression "would you like" in the spoken corpus occurred more frequently in the equal context with a total number of 1779 occurrences accounting for 61% of all the occurrences.

Table 7
Request, Would You Like, Spoken Context

	Request	
	Interactional-oriented	Task-oriented
Frequency	2710	172

In interactional-oriented request, the speakers talk to build a relationship for social purposes and task-oriented request emerges while a collaboration is made on a topic by the speakers. Table 7 illustrates that the expression "would you like" in the spoken corpus occurred more frequently in the interactional-oriented context with a total number of 2710 occurrences accounting for 94% of all the occurrences. It means that most of the interactions were made to establish relationships for social purposes.

Table 8
Imposition, Would You Like, Spoken Context

	Imposition	
	-	+
Frequency	2670	212

Table 8 illustrates that the expression "would you like" in the spoken corpus occurred more frequently without any imposition with a total number of 2670 occurrences accounting for 92% of all the occurrences. Therefore, most of the expressions suggested a particular action to the hearer.

Total number of the occurrences of expression "Would you like" in the academic corpus was 164. This section addresses request categories of COCA corpus as Context type, Type of request, speakers, social power, interactional-oriented, task-oriented, and imposition. context types.

Table 9
Context Type, Would You Like, Academic Context

	Context Type				
	Intimate	Sociocultural	Professional	Pedagogical	Transactional
Frequency	0	58	14	85	7

The expression "would you like" in the academic corpus occurred more frequently in the pedagogical context with a total number of 85 occurrences accounting for 51% of all the occurrences. As it is called pedagogical, the intended contexts were schools, universities, and teacher-student interactions.

Table 10
Type of Request, Would You Like, Academic Context

	Request Type	
	Action	Information
Frequency	80	84

In the type of request section, the expression "would you like" in the academic corpus was approximately equal in both types of action and information. Table 10 illustrates that 80 occurrences accounting for 48% of all the occurrences were request for an action and 84 occurrences accounting for 51% of all the occurrences were suggestions.

Table 11
Social Power, Would You Like, Academic Context

	Social Power			
	High-low	Low-high	Equal	One-sided (like author)
Frequency	69	1	37	57

Regarding social power, there were three stages: high-low, low-high, and equal. But in the academic context, there is yet another level called one-sided like when an author has written something which does not have any other participant or interlocutors. The expression "would you like" in the academic corpus occurred more frequently in the high-low context with a total number of 69 occurrences accounting for 42% of all the occurrences. It means that "would you like" expressions in the academic context occurred more frequently when the status of the speaker was higher than the hearer.

Table 12
Request, Would You Like, Academic Context

	Request	
	Interactional-oriented	Task-oriented
Frequency	88	76

The expression "would you like" in the academic corpus occurred more frequently in the interactional-oriented context with a total number of 88 occurrences accounting for 53% of all the occurrences.

Table 13
Imposition, Would You Like, Academic Context

	Imposition	
	-	+
Frequency	144	20

The expression "would you like" in the academic occurred more frequently in the with no imposition with a total number of 144 occurrences accounting for 87% of all the occurrences. Accordingly, most of the expressions suggested a particular action to the hearer.

Table 14
Context Type, Would You Mind, Spoken Context

	Context Type				
	Intimate	Sociocultural	Professional	Pedagogical	Transactional
Frequency	8	2	3	0	94

The expression "would you mind" in the spoken corpus occurred more frequently in the transactional context with a total number of 94 occurrences accounting for 87% of all the occurrences.

Table 15
Type of Request, Would You mind, Spoken Context

	Request Type	
	Action	Information
Frequency	92	15

In the type of request section, the expression "would you mind" in the spoken corpus occurred more frequently as request for an action with a total number of 92 occurrences accounting for 85% of all the occurrences.

Table 16
Social Power, Would You mind, Spoken Context

	Social Power		
	High-low	Low-high	Equal
Frequency	28	32	47

The "would you mind" expressions in spoken context occurred more frequently in the equal status with a total number of 47 occurrences accounting for 43% of all the occurrences.

Table 17
Request, Would You mind, Spoken Context

	Request	
	Interactional-oriented	Task-oriented
Frequency	62	45

The expression "would you mind" in the spoken context occurred more frequently in the interactional-oriented context with a total number of 62 occurrences accounting for 57% of all the occurrences. It means most of the interactions were to build a relationship for social needs.

Table 18
Imposition, Would You mind, Spoken Context

	Imposition	
	-	+
Frequency	95	12

Table 18 illustrates that most of the expressions suggested a particular action to the hearer or giving information. The expression "would you mind" in the spoken context occurred more frequently with no imposition with a total number of 95 occurrences accounting for 88% of all the occurrences.

In sum, it is notable that the frequency in the spoken context especially for the expression "would you like" was quite high with a total number of 2882 occurrences accounting for 91.4% of all the occurrences. Moreover, "would you like" in the academic context with a total number of 164 occurrences accounting for 5.2% of all the occurrences "would you mind" in the spoken context with a total

number of 107 occurrences accounting for 3.4% of all the occurrences, and finally "would you mind" in the academic context with no occurrence ranked respectively.

The expression "would you like" in the spoken corpus in the context type occurred more frequently in the transactional context with a high frequency. As it is called transactional, it means two strangers are collaborating on a particular subject. The expression "would you like" in the academic corpus in the context type occurred more frequently in the pedagogical context. As it is called pedagogical, the contexts are schools, universities, and teacher-student interactions. The expression "would you mind" in the spoken corpus in the context type occurred more frequently in the transactional part. In the type of request section, the expression "would you like" in the spoken corpus occurred more frequently as information or suggestion and scarcely and minimally as requesting for an action. The expression "would you like" in the academic corpus occurred almost equally in both parts of action and information. The expression "would you mind" in the spoken corpus occurred more frequently as an action and minimally as information. The expression "would you like" in the spoken corpus in the social power occurred more frequently as equal participants, in the equal status. The expression "would you like" in the academic corpus occurred more frequently as high-low social power. The expression "would you mind" in the spoken corpus occurred more frequently as equal participants. The expression "would you like" in the spoken corpus occurred more frequently in the interactional-oriented with a very high frequency. It means most of the interactions included social goals to establish a relationship. The expression "would you like" in the academic corpus occurred equally in both interactional-oriented and task-oriented interactions. The expression "would you mind" in the spoken corpus occurred more frequently in the interactional-oriented with a high frequency.

The expression "would you like" in the spoken corpus occurred more frequently without any imposition. In the same vein, most of the expressions suggested a particular action to the hearer without compelling another to fulfill a request. The expression "would you like" in the academic corpus occurred more frequently without any imposition. The expression "would you mind" in the spoken corpus occurred more frequently without any imposition.

5. Discussion

This study examined how corpus linguistics is able to contribute to the analysis of discourse as speech acts. The present research employed a corpus method to investigate the request speech act, as linguistic realizations of request speech act, "would you like" and "would you mind" were selected for the aim of the study. As a corpus takes advantage of language by a broad range of speakers and in a vast variety of social discussions and contexts, corpus-based investigations will bring scientific proof of structures in the use of language.

There are always some collocational patterns co-occurring with the request expressions. In the present study, the results showed that some words co-occur more frequently with the request expressions "would you like" and "would you mind." The first research question delved into the most frequent patterns collocating with "would you like" and "would you mind". The expression "would you like" in the spoken context mostly co-occurs with the words: "to, what, it, and see." The expression "would you like" in the academic context of the corpus mostly co-occurred with the words: "to, what, and how". The expression "would you mind" in the spoken context co-occurred more frequently with the words: "if, me, and I."

The second research question probed the collocational differences in the use of "would you like" and "would you mind". The request expression "would you like" co-occurred with greater variation of words in the spoken context than the academic context. One possible justification for this difference might stem from the fact that the request expression "would you like" occurs more frequently in the spoken context. Therefore, it is clear that there are more words which co-occur with this expression in the spoken contexts than in the academic contexts.

The expression "would you like" in the spoken corpus mostly occurred with the words: "to, what, it, and see." The expression "would you like" in the academic corpus mostly occurred with the words: "to, what, and how." The expression "would you mind" in the spoken corpus mostly occurred with the words: "if, me, and I". One probable explanation would be the difference in linguistic forms of the requests where "would you like" is more likely to occur followed by an "infinitive" or in the interrogative format following "what" whereas "would you mind" is usually followed by "if" or "I" asking for permission.

The third question deal with the influence of co-text on the functions of "would you like" and "would you mind." Simple distinctions in expressions' functions are

challenging to make. There seems to be one dominant meaning that incorporates all other utterances, considering the various functions. Indeed, it is the semantic meaning of the expressions of the request that impacts particular pragmatic functions. Due to the adjacent co-text, these functions often do not change, but they can change due to the pragmatic functions and the objective of the speakers. The collocations do not affect the function of these requests rather it is the intention of the speakers which affects the expression of request. The finding of the present study was incongruent with previous studies (Adolphs, 2008; Diani, 2004), which regarded an expression to be hypothetically affected by prior utterances and theoretically affecting the role of the following statement. The results revealed that most of the "would you like" and "would you mind" examples were used to express a polite offer, make a request, ask others' opinions, ask for an advice, and offer an opinion.

The fourth question examined factors affecting the choice of these request expressions in the limited-focus Corpus Analysis of Requests, contextual elements like aim of the action and context of conversations were presented as influencing the forms of request employed by participants. This is in line with Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) notion who proposed almost the same thing. Other factors such as social power, social distance, and imposition impact forms which interlocutors choose to use. This is in consistent with Rhinier (2007) who performed a request pilot study on a limited Internet corpus. The goal was to check out the contextual distinctions where the forms of request were used: "would you" and "could you." The written corpus of the situational comedy, *Frasier*, conducted in eleven episodes, had been investigated. The data was described by the show fans and sent to the website of the fan with a search feature. This corpus was studied for all the phrases "would you" and "could you", and the utterances identified as requests were chosen and retrieved including the large context in which the sentences occurred. The contextual elements indicated were the social power (high/low/equal), social distance (+/- intimate), the positive/negative propositional requests content, entitlement, and imposition of the compliance and request. These findings are congruent with Vine (2009) who examined conversations in an office context in which the contextual variables collocated with modal interrogations and imperatives (could/can/would/will you). She claimed that while status and social power serve a significant responsibility in the diversity of the methods used, it still would not specifically take into consideration the variations of linguistic structures. She stated that the aim of interaction (task allocating, problem solving), as well as the goal of

the directives and the frequency are greatly affected by modes (Vine, 2009). In the same vein, the present study demonstrates that the aim of speakers highly impacted the forms they use rather than the categories of social power, imposition and other intervening factors.

6. Conclusion

The research conducted to evaluate the collocational patterns of request expressions "would you like" and "would you mind." The study results revealed that such expressions in the spoken corpus were used more frequently in the transactional context which means that the interlocutors collaborated on a particular subject, also with equal status and as interactional-oriented. Nevertheless, in the academic corpus, the same expressions were used more frequently in the pedagogical context, with the high-low status and as both interactional-oriented that is when the speakers talk to build a relationship for social purposes and also task-oriented request that emerges while a collaboration is made on a topic by the speakers. The expression "would you like" was mostly used to give information, but "would you mind" was usually used to request an action. These expressions of request were not used for the purpose of imposition in any of the context. It means these expressions were used almost always as suggestion not imposing anything.

This study strived to add to the existing literature on corpus-based request speech act studies. It sought to discover whether native speakers of English make any differences in utilizing these request expressions "would you like" and "would you mind." The findings might contribute to our overall comprehension of the variations which matter between the request expressions "would you like" and "would you mind" and could broaden the scope of studies on pragmatics and speech acts. Furthermore, the study considers the important role of pragmatics in the eyes of native speakers and more importantly, helps to shed more light on how, when and why one chooses one of the expressions "would you like" and "would you mind."

The findings of the present study might have some pedagogical implications for EFL learners, teachers and materials and curriculum developers. As noted earlier, non-native English speakers can take the definite intra-language variations or similarities for granted, although in reality this may not actually be true and native English speakers possess that knowledge. It may lead to inadequate understanding of the language or misinterpretation of language. Language learners will benefit

from the results of the study, since they will be familiarized with the co-occurring collocational patterns of "would you like" and "would you mind" and will probably make the best choice when placed under the same situations.

Moreover, teachers will gain insights into how and when these expressions are used and which collocations are more frequent with these two expressions so as to focus more carefully on them and make informed and proper decisions within pedagogical contexts with regard to them accordingly. Furthermore, course materials developers will also be provided with valuable information with regard to the inclusion of such expressions and their collocations in their books and courses.

Curriculum developers may as well resort to the findings of the study and incorporate them into the syllabus. Ultimately, the findings of the study may inform the institute administrators about the importance of paying attention to speech acts as an important part of communication and dedicate a substantial portion of class time to them. From an educational point of view, studies on the grammar of speech acts will strongly promote the EFL learners to educate and analyze how to make effective use of speech acts.

Further studies on different speech acts, their collocational patterns and usage can be conducted. The other string of study could be used to examine the influence of instructing speech acts with regard to sociocognitive and cognitive elements on the language proficiency of L2 speakers. Furthermore, it is proposed that more work on nonverbal dimensions and characteristics like the learner's body language, facial expression, and tones be done. This study did not take into account some factors like gender and age; therefore, other studies could be carried out with age-related differences or gender-based differences to find out the impact of such factors on the collocational patterns for request expressions and their functions. The main point in the current research is the size of the sample that is delimited to COCA corpus and only spoken and academic contexts. Future studies can increase the size and diversity of information employed.

References

- Adolphs, S. (2008). *Corpus and context: Investigating pragmatic functions in spoken discourse*. Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.30>
- Andersen, G. (2001). *Pragmatic markers and sociolinguistic variation: A Relevance-Theoretic Approach to the Language of Adolescents*. John Benjamins Publishing Company
- Aydin, H. (2012). Multicultural education curriculum development in Turkey. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(3), 277–286. <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2012.v3n3p277>
- Barekat, B., & Mehri, M. (2013). Investigating the effect of metalinguistic feedback in L2 pragmatic instruction. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 5(2), 197–208. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v5i2.3032>
- Bataineh, R. F., & Bataineh, R. F. (2006). Apology strategies of Jordanian EFL university students. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(11), 1901–1927. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v5i2.3032>
- Birjandi, P., & Derakhshan, A. (2014). Pragmatic comprehension of apology, request and refusal: An investigation on the effect of consciousness-raising video-driven prompts. *Applied Research on English Language*, 3(1), 67-86. <https://doi.org/10.22108/ARE.2014.15479>
- Blum-Kulka, S. & House, J. (1989). Cross-cultural and situational variation in requestive behavior in five languages. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics* (pp. 123–154). Ablex.
- Camiciottoli, B. (2009). "Just wondering if you could comment on that": Indirect requests for information in corporate earning calls. *Text & Talk*, 29(6), 661–681. <https://doi.org/10.1515/TEXT.2009.034>
- Curl, T. S. & Drew, p. (2008). Contingency and action: A comparison of two forms of requesting. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 41(2). 129–153. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351810802028613>
- Derakhshan, A., & Eslami, Z. R. (2019). Second language pragmatics: From theory to research. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 16(5), 611-617. <https://doi.org/10.22055/RALS.2021.16722>.

- Derakhshan, A., & Shakki, F. (2020). The effect of implicit vs. explicit metapragmatic instruction on the Iranian intermediate EFL learners' pragmatic comprehension of apology and refusal. *Journal of Language Research*, 12(35), 151-175.
- Derakhshan, A., & Shakki, F. (2021). A meta-analytic study of instructed second language pragmatics: A case of the speech act of request. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, 12(1), 15–32. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2019-0030>
- Derakhshan, A., Shakki, F., & Sarani, M. A. (2020). The effect of dynamic and non-dynamic assessment on the comprehension of Iranian intermediate EFL learners' speech acts of apology and request. *Language Related Research*, 11(4), 605–637. <https://doi.org/20.1001.1.23223081.1399.11.4.25.0>
- Diani, G. (2004). The discourse functions of 'I don't know' in English conversation. In K. Aijmer and A. B. Stenström (Eds.), *Discourse patterns in spoken and written corpora* (pp. 157–71). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.120.11dia>
- Eslami-Rasekh, Z., Eslami-Rasekh, A. & Fatahi, A. (2004). Using metapragmatic instruction to improve advanced EFL learners' pragmatic awareness. *TESL EJ*, 8(2), 1–12.
- Evert, S. (2007). Corpora and collocations (extended manuscript). In A. Ludeling and M. Kytö (Eds.), *Corpus Linguistics. An International Handbook*. (pp. 1212–1248). Walter de Gruyter.
- Holmes, J. (1990). Hedges and booster in women's and men's speech. *Language and Communication*, 10(3), 185–205. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0271-5309\(90\)90002-S](https://doi.org/10.1016/0271-5309(90)90002-S)
- Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic discourse*. Continuum.
- Leech, G. (2000). Grammars of spoken English: New outcomes of corpus-oriented research. *Language Learning*. 50(4). 675–724. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00143>
- Leech, G. (2014). *The pragmatics of politeness*. Oxford University Press.
- Liu, C. (2007). *Pragmatics in foreign language instruction: the effects of pedagogical intervention and technology on the development of EFL learners' realization of request*. (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). Texas A&M University, College Station, TX. <https://hdl.handle.net/1969.1/ETD-TAMU-2490>
- Luo, X. & Gao, J. (2011). On pragmatic failures in second language learning. *Theory*

- and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(3), 283–286.
<https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.1.3.283-286>
- Malmir, A., & Taji, N. (2021). The interplay of action, context, and linguistic vs. non-linguistic resources in L2 pragmatic performance: The case of requests and refusals. *Language Related Research*, 12(3), 213–250. <https://doi.org/20.1001.1.23223081.1400.12.3.7.7>
- Macaulay, M. (2001). Tough talk: Indirectness and gender in requests for information. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33(2), 293–316. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(99\)00129-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00129-0)
- Ogiermann, E. (2008). On the culture-specificity of linguistic gender differences: The case of English and Russian apologies. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 5(3), 259–286. <https://doi.org/10.1515/IPRG.2008.013>
- Partington, A. (2003). *The linguistics of political argument: The spin-doctor and the wolf pack at the White House*. Routledge
- Pishghadam, R., Ebrahimi, S., Shairi, H. R., & Derakhshan, A. (2021). Introducing “Emoling” as the missing link in ethnography of communication: A complement to Hymes’ SPEAKING Model. *Language Related Research*, 12(1), 1–41. <https://doi.org/20.1001.1.23223081.1400.12.1.11.7>
- Reppen, R. (2010). *Using corpora in the language classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rhinier, L. (2007). ‘Could you’ or ‘would you’: Requests, modals and implicature in the situational comedy *Frasier*. Paper presented at the University of Texas, Arlington, Texas, USA.
- Rühlemann, C. (2010). What can a corpus tell us about pragmatics? In A. O’Keeffe & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of corpus linguistic* (pp. 288–301). Routledge.
- Salazar, P. (2007). Examining mitigation in requests: A focus on transcripts in ELT coursebooks. In E. Alcon Soler & M. Safont (Eds.), *Intercultural language use and language learning* (pp. 207–222). Springer.
- Sarac-Suzer, S. (2008). Coping with socio-pragmatic failure: Suggested activities. *Major Articles Journal*, 10(3), 1–7.

- Scarantino, A. (2017). How to do things with emotional expressions: The theory of affective pragmatics. *Psychological Inquiry*, 28(2-3), 165-185. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2017.1328951>
- Shakki, F. (2022). Meta-analysis as an emerging trend to scrutinize the effectiveness of L2 pragmatics instruction. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1016661>
- Shakki, F., Naeini, J., Mazandarani, O., & Derakhshan, A. (2020). Instructed second language English pragmatics in the Iranian context. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 39(1), 201-252. <https://doi.org/10.22099/jtls.2020.38481.2886>.
- Shakki, F., Naeini, J., Mazandarani, O., & Derakhshan, A. (2021). Instructed second language pragmatics for the speech act of apology in an Iranian EFL context: A meta-analysis. *Applied Research on English Language*, 10(3), 77-104. <https://doi.org/10.22108/ARE.2021.128213.1709>.
- Shakki, F., Naeini, J., Mazandarani, O., & Derakhshan, A. (2023). A meta-analysis on the instructed second language pragmatics for the speech acts of apology, request, and refusal in an Iranian EFL context. *Language Related Research*, 13(6), 461-510. <https://doi:10.52547/LRR.13.6.15>
- Stubbs, M. (2007). An example of frequent English phraseology: distributions, structures and functions. In Facchinetti, R. (ed.), *Corpus linguistics 25 years on* (pp. 87-105). Brill Rodopi.
- Thomas, J. (2006). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *World Englishes: Critical Concepts in Linguistics*, 4(2), 22. <https://doi.org/10.29366/2019tlc.3.1.5>
- Triki, M. (2013). A Pragmatic Approach to the Study of English /Arabic Translation Errors. *Journal Academica*, 3(1), 39-51.
- Tsui, A. B. M. (1991). The pragmatic functions of I don't know. *Text*, 11(4), 607-622. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1991.11.4.607>
- Vine, B. (2009). Directives at work: Exploring the contextual complexity of workplace directives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(7), 1395-1405. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.03.001>
- Wichmann, A. (2004). The intonation of please-requests: a corpus-based study. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36(9), 1521-1549. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2004.03.003>

Yu, M. C. (2008). Teaching and learning sociolinguistic skills in university EFL classes in Taiwan. *TESOL Quarterly*, 42(1), 31–52. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2008.tb00206.x>

Zamborlin, C. (2007). Going beyond pragmatic failures: Dissonance in intercultural communication. *Intercultural pragmatics*, 4(1), 21–50. <https://doi.org/10.1515/IP.2007.002>

About the Authors

Reza Bagheri Nevisi is an Associate Professor of Applied Linguistics at University of Qom, Iran. His research interests include teaching methodologies, interlanguage pragmatics, corpus linguistics and language assessment in general, task-based language teaching, speech acts and speaking assessment in particular.

Fatemeh Miri is an MA graduate from University of Qom. She is mainly interested in corpus linguistics research.