

## Investigating teachers' perceptions and instructional practices regarding form- focused instruction of speech acts in the Iranian EFL context

Melihat Amir Jahansouz Shahi, Neda Gharagozloo\*, and Reza Raissi

Department of English Translation , Varamin-Pishva Branch, Islamic Azad University, Varamin, Iran

### ABSTRACT

Mastery over speech acts plays a significant role in the accomplishment of communication between interlocutors. Thus, the present study aimed to investigate Iranian EFL Instructors' perception and instructional practices towards form-focused instruction of speech acts, specifically request, apology, and invitation. To this aim, through a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design, the present researchers selected 30 English language instructors in Islamic Azad University (IAU) of North Tehran Branch based on criterion sampling as the study participants. All the participants completed an adapted version of Pragmatic Knowledge Questionnaire (PKQ), and were successively interviewed in terms of their claimed perceptions and practices regarding form-focused instruction of speech acts through a semi-structured interview. Finally, six classes were observed by the researchers to get informed of their real classroom practices. The results of data analyses were then triangulated, and the findings revealed that Iranian EFL instructors used explicit strategies rather than implicit strategies to instruct speech acts in their classes. Also, they presumed and agreed that explicit instruction is more effective since this technique seems to be easier, understandable and without ambiguity for the learners. The results of the current study are beneficial for EFL instructors, syllabus designers, materials developers, and scholastic administrators to enrich the current English language teaching curricula.

**Keywords:** Form-focused instruction; instructors' perceptions; instructors' instructional practices; speech acts

**First Received:**

19 December 2021

**Revised:**

18 April 2022

**Accepted:**

21 May 2022

**Final Proof Received:**

24 May 2022

**Published:**

31 May 2022

### How to cite (in APA style):

Shahi, M. A. J., Gharagozloo, N., & Raissi, R. (2022). Investigating teachers' perceptions and instructional practices regarding form- focused instruction of speech acts in the Iranian EFL context. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(1), 164-179.  
<https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v12i1.41699>

### INTRODUCTION

Pragmatic competence in a second/foreign language is difficult to develop. That is why a lot of EFL learners find it challenging to understand the proposed meaning interpretations expressed by the speech acts because they are mainly determined by the situational context (Baker & Abdzadeh, 2020; McConachy & Liddicoat, 2022, Rajabi et al., 2015). Based on Kondo (2008), the suitable practice of language is extremely linked to its cultural tenets and situations. Reports from the classroom context

have also signified that inappropriate use of the speech acts by the instructors will lead to misunderstanding and low quality development of learners in this respect (Nurani, 2015).

Most of the research carried out to solve the challenges of teaching pragmatics in the language classroom and to enable EFL/ESL learners to interact effectively, have concentrated on syntactic mistakes as the basis of communication failure (Ansarin & Mohamadi, 2013; Martínez-Flor & Usó-Juan, 2010). On the other hand, error correction can

\* Corresponding Author  
Email: Neda.Gharagozloo@iau.ac.ir

have more detrimental effects than the grammatical faults for the non-native speaker which might categorize him/her as unhelpful, impolite and aggressive (Crandall & Basturkmen, 2004). Many second/foreign language learners seem to struggle to display pragmatic maturity once it appears in real-life circumstances, and the situation is also valid for fluent students (Amiri & Javanshir, 2017; DeCapua & Dunham, 2007; Hinkel, 1997; Martínez Flor, 2005; Pishghadam & Sharafaddini, 2011; Savvidou & Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2019). In educational contexts, training inter-language pragmatics (ILP) and its principles aiming at enhancing learners' pragmatic knowledge has been taken into account (Amiri & Birjandi, 2015; Kamarudin, 2020; Kasper & Rose, 2002; Sykes, 2017; Takimoto, 2012). Furthermore, teaching language functions and speech acts to EFL learners proved effective in enhancing EFL learners' inter-language pragmatics. (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; Halenko & Jones, 2011; Hmouri, 2021; Kasper, 2001; Malmir, 2021; Malmir & Derakhshan, 2020; Martínez-Flor & Usó-Juan, 2020; Olshtain & Cohen, 1990; Soler & Pitarch, 2010; Wattananukij & Pongpaibroj, 2020).

Both explicit and implicit instruction of speech acts and inter-language pragmatics have been the home of choice for ELT researchers: Through explicit instruction, the learners' brain is activated and tries to explain the difficulties deliberately and examine the associated memory (Eysenck & Keane, 2020). Learners study better when they need to study from rational involvements rather than perceptual comparisons (Schmidt, 1990). Besides, the instructor may offer some explanations to the class with explicit instructions (Amiri, 2019; Bardovi-Harlig, 2018; Rajabi & Farahian, 2013; Schmidt, 1993; Soler, 2002) providing them with to the point practical examples and language in use. In this regard, explicit teaching of speech acts to EFL learners, which usually involves defining, illustrating, and conversing a target realization and comparison concerning L1 and L2 have found supporters among ELT researchers and practitioners (Rajabi et al., 2015; Salemi et al., 2012). Likewise, implicit instruction of speech acts in which the instructor plays the role of a facilitator, has been found effective (Alerwi & Alzahrani, 2020; Dole, 2000). In addition, some other studies have indicated that both implicit and explicit instructions of speech acts are conducive to good results in awareness-raising and helping learners improve their inter-language pragmatic performance (Farshi & Baghbani, 2015; Fordyce, 2014).

Previous studies have specified that among the English language speech acts, request, apology and invitation are the most problematic speech acts for the EFL learners, and they need high levels of suitability and considerable cultural and linguistic skills to use them appropriately (Amiri et al., 2015;

Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Brown & Levinson, 1978).

Silva (2003) also considers cultural aspects as the hidden factors which should be taught to the EFL learners. The teaching of speech acts so vitally involves both language and culture that interactions using them may have a high impact.

There are a good number of studies reporting on beliefs and practices of teaching pragmatics by ESL instructors (Ishihara, 2010; Ishihara & Cohen, 2014; Savvidou & Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2019; Young & Walsh, 2010). However, what is of prime significance is the discrepancy between EFL instructors' knowledge of inter-language pragmatics and their classroom practices (Davarzani & Talebzadeh, 2020; Farashaiyan et al., 2020), which has been less paid attention to by Iranian scholars. To address the gap, the present study examined thoughts, beliefs, and practices of Iranian EFL instructors with respect to teaching speech acts of request, apology and invitation through form-focused instruction.

For many years, getting familiar with grammatical rules and large amounts of vocabularies were the main purpose of language teaching. However, gradually it was proved that learners with great success in English grammar and vocabulary were not able to communicate effectively and appropriately in foreign language (Krisnawati, 2011). The objective of defining the development of L2 pragmatic capability in SLA is discussed here by examining the ties concerning SLA and interactive capability, pragmatic ability and teaching L2 pragmatic skills. In this realm Choraih et al. (2016) explored the importance of pragmatic competence in English language teaching. They offered evidence that language proficiency could not only be equated with well-formed grammatical skills, but also with how to use them in the target language properly and effectively.

Similarly, Alinezhad (2015) demonstrated that pragmatics should be considered as a subdivision of linguistics and its important role in SL should be considered in an academic context. He mentioned that the expansion of pragmatic capability can be established to L2 learners and instructors as the primitive teaching goals. Through using pragmatic competence in English language teaching, learners can understand numerous stages of grammar and functions in an accurate and fluent mode.

Concerning this issue, Aufa (2013) investigated the efficiency of DCT (Discourse Completion Task) as an explicit pragmatic teaching to assist second language learners in enhancing their pragmatic competence. The results supported the effectiveness of explicit instruction in some variations of linguistic forms that assisted in improvement of learners' pragmatic competence. Besides, Dang and Nguyen (2013) studied the effect of indirect explicit grammar teaching on EFL

learners' ability of English language tenses. The outcomes specified that explicit grammar group meaningfully outdid the implicit grammar group concerning the grammatical rules and the oral expertise. Additionally, there was a positive association between the grammar rules and their following practice. Similarly, Bakhshayesh and Jafari (2018) investigated the impact of input improvement and explicit teaching on promoting Iranian EFL learners' explicit awareness of present tense and past passive voice. The findings showed the advantage of the explicit teaching in enhancing explicit awareness of passive voice. Additionally, Tajeddin and Hosseinpour (2014) highlighted awareness-raising accomplishments as an ameliorative process for learners to acquire socio-pragmatic and pragma linguistic information. They investigated the efficiency of deductive, inductive and L1-based awareness raising on EFL learners' attainment of the request speech act. The findings showed that training meaningfully had positive effect on learners' attainment of the request speech act. Besides, comparison of the task types confirmed that deductive activity was the most operative one. Likewise, the longitudinal research of Ifantidou (2013) verified the efficacy of explicit instruction on the growth of pragmatic competence of learners by analyzing different features of pragmatic capability through the application of various means. The long-term effects of learning in the second group were entirely due to the specific teaching procedures in this investigation. Likewise, Arabmofrad et al. (2019), examined the association between Iranian advanced EFL learners' meta-pragmatic consciousness, its features and their overall and definite pragmatic motivation. In this investigation, the speech act of refusal was designated as a target speech act. The findings specified that there was a significant relationship between Iranian EFL learners' meta-pragmatic consciousness and their pragmatic inspiration.

Similarly, Azarmi and Behnam (2012) examined the capability of the upper intermediate and the intermediate learners in keeping face in diverse complaint circumstances. The results showed that learners in both levels applied diverse sorts of speech acts in each condition. Researchers highlighted that some degree of pragmatic consciousness should be offered at low levels too. Based on the previous experiences, most of the studies in the Iranian EFL context focused on learners' perception towards form-focused instruction but EFL instructors' educational perceptions and their practices towards the instruction were rarely considered in the Iranian EFL context. In order to fill the gap in the literature and accomplish the purpose of the study, the following research questions were posed by the researchers:

1. What are the instructors' perceptions towards form-focused instruction of speech acts of request, apology and invitation?
2. How do the instructors practice form-focused instruction of speech acts of request, apology and invitation in EFL classes?

## **METHOD**

### **Participants**

The current study has two phases, quantitative and qualitative. The researchers used a mixed-methods design to gather the required data. In the quantitative phase of the study, 30 English language instructors from the IAU, North Tehran Branch, were selected based on criterion sampling (Patton, 2001) as the participants of the present study. The criteria encompassed participants' major, teaching experience and their professional career. Then, in the qualitative phase of the study, all of the participants took part in an in-depth interview. Furthermore, six instructors' classes were randomly designated for observation sessions.

### **Instruments**

Three instruments were used in this study. The first instrument was Pragmatics Knowledge Questionnaire (PKQ). It was applied to evaluate instructors' perceptions concerning teaching and learning pragmatics and the approaches and procedures they employed in their classes. The data gained from the questionnaire were merged with the data gained from the second instrument, interview, to answer the first research question. The second instrument was a semi-structured interview used to find both beliefs and claimed practices of instructors with respect to teaching speech acts. And the third instrument was observation scheme used to check the teaching strategies and practices in the foreign language classroom. The results of the interview were merged with the results of the observation scheme and the results of the observation scheme were merged with the data gained from the questionnaire to answer the second research question.

### **Instrument 1**

The first instrument was Pragmatics Knowledge Questionnaire (PKQ). The PKQ was adopted from Ji (2007) and Kachru (1992), and then it was adapted by the researchers based on the Iranian EFL context. The PKQ included 5 items pertained to demographic notions and 18 items related to perceptions of instructors towards teaching inter-language pragmatics: request (items 6,7,8,9,10,11), apology (items 12,13,14,15,16,17) and invitation (items 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23). Likewise, the questionnaire included 6 items (24, 25, 26, 27, 28,

29) related to the methods and techniques applied in the class to teach speech acts. It was applied to evaluate instructors' insights concerning teaching and learning pragmatics and the approaches and procedures they use in their classes. In the pilot study, the reliability index of the PKQ was estimated prior to its administration with 30 EFL instructors and the total Cronbach's alpha reliability of questionnaire was  $\alpha=.802$ , which was satisfactory. Based on Dornyei and Taguchi (2010), the index reliability was beyond 0.60 which enjoys an acceptable reliability. In this study, the KMO of the factor analysis of the instructors' questionnaire was 0.65, which was above 0.5 and acceptable.

**Instrument 2**

The second instrument was a semi-structured interview to find both beliefs and claimed practices of the study participants with respect to teaching speech acts. In the pilot study, five Ph.D. holders of TEFL approved the content validity of the instructors' interview through expert judgment validity. The point of view of five academia about the validity of interview questions was 82%.

**Instrument 3**

The third instrument was observation scheme. The Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT) observation scheme by Spada & Fröhlich (1995) was used to check the macro level teaching strategies and practices of the EFL instructors teaching inter-language pragmatics in the foreign language classroom. Concerning the observation scheme, the investigators used inter-coder reliability enquiry which was .88 and satisfactory in that it indicated the significant agreement between the raters. In the pilot study, five Ph.D. holders of TEFL approved the content validity of the classroom observation scheme through expert judgment validity. The point of view of five academia about the validity of observation scheme was 81.5%.

**Procedure**

To improve the credibility and validity of the examination, the current investigation applied a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design. The researchers used the triangulation technique to achieve the intended goals of the investigation. Firstly, the instructors completed the PKQ, and then they were interviewed in terms of their perspectives concerning form-focused instruction of speech acts in the language classroom as well as their opinions and practices about implicit and explicit teaching of speech acts. In the third step, six of the instructors' classes were randomly observed over 8 weeks, once a week during a 90-min instructional period.

**Data Analysis**

The quantitative data was analyzed using SPSS software, version 26, and frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation were estimated to fulfill the descriptive analysis section. Concerning the qualitative part, the interview and observation, the researchers used thematic analysis. According to Ezzy (2002) coding denotes the procedure of "disassembling and reuniting the information". Thematic analysis was used as a method to analyze the repeated patterns of qualitative data (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

**FINDINGS**

**Instructors' perceptions towards form-focused instruction of speech acts of request, apology and invitation**

This section presents the results of the questionnaire data concerning instructors' perceptions towards teaching pragmatics of request, apology, and invitation in the classroom. The descriptive statistics concerning the instructors' perceptions towards the speech acts are presented in three different tables.

**Table 1**

*Descriptive Statistics; Instructors' Perceptions towards Teaching Speech Act of Request*

Questionnaire items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	N*
6 I think the knowledge of how to use request is necessary for EFL learners	-	-	-	18 60 %	12 40%	30
7- I think learners' consciousness raising of gaining information on culture and suitable language use is more beneficial for learning request	-	5 16.6%	-	10 33.3%	15 50.0%	30
8- I believe instructors should teach request speech acts when learners attain a certain level of language ability	-	5 16.7%	-	13 43.3%	12 40%	30
9- I teach explicit performatives of request first	-	-	-	13 43.3%	17 56.6%	30
10- I think conventionally indirect strategies challenge learners for learning request	-	-	18 60.0%	7 23.3%	5 16.6%	30
11- I believe learning English means learning speech acts specifically request	-	-	-	19 63.3%	11 36.6%	30

\*N = Number of Participants

As displayed in Table 1, concerning item 6 “I think the knowledge of how to use request speech act is necessary for EFL learners”, all contributors approved or strongly agreed with it. The result is in line with the interview part. For example, instructor 11 has confessed:

*"The inappropriate application of speech act may result in misinterpretation between interlocutors. Learners may have diverse clarifications of a statement. This is caused by the failure of using speech acts in certain situations".*

Half of the instructors 50.0 % strongly agreed with item 7 as “I believe learners’ consciousness raising of getting information on culture and suitable language practice is more beneficial for learning request speech act”, while 16.6 % disagreed with this idea. The result is in line with the findings of the interview. For example, instructor 23 mentioned:

*"I think building language awareness help learners to integrate what has been learned with the new information. It also supports thinking and problem-solving, developing and maintaining the relationships".*

Item 8 “I believe instructors should teach request speech act when learners attain a specific level of language ability” was accepted by most EFL instructors and 43.3 % agreed, though 16.7 % disagreed. This result is also in line with the interview results as supported in the views presented by instructors. For example, instructor 18 mentioned that:

*"I personally think that the level of learners is important too, I mean I start indirect teaching in advanced classes. Due to their language proficiency level, learners can easily deal with indirect way of teaching strategies".*

Regarding item 9 “I teach explicit performatives of request first” most contributors 43.3% agreed with this perception. The result is in line with the interview findings as 80% of the instructors considered direct and explicit instructional strategies in their teaching. For example, as instructor 8 mentioned:

*"direct teaching is effective, because it seems to be easier, understandable and without ambiguity for the learners with a low level of English knowledge. They don't need to think about other meanings of the utterance or actually to go beyond the normal meaning of the sentence".*

Considering item 10 “I think conventionally indirect strategies challenge learners for learning request” the contributors did not agree. Most of the instructors 60.0 % were impartial, whereas 23.3% agreed with that statement. The result supports the interview part. For example, instructor 9 proposed that:

*"Lower proficiency learners have problems in the use of this strategy whereas expert learners overused the conventional indirect strategy form".*

Concerning item 11 “I believe learning English means learning speech acts specifically request” most of the contributors (63.3%) agreed and the rest, strongly agreed. The result supports the interview part. For example, instructor 6 mentioned that:

*"one of the important areas of language is that of communicative speech acts that convey the willed language functions, so learning speech acts somehow means learning English".*

Table 2 presents the instructors’ perceptions towards teaching speech act of apology.

**Table 2**  
*Descriptive Statistics; Instructors’ Perceptions towards Teaching Speech Act of Apology*

Questionnaire items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	N*
12- I think the knowledge of how to use apology is necessary for EFL learners	-	-	-	18 60.0%	12 40.0%	30
13- I think learners’ consciousness raising of getting information on culture and suitable language practice is more beneficial for learning apology	-	6 20.0%	-	17 56.6%	7 23.3%	30
14- I think instructors should teach apology speech act when learners achieve a certain level of language ability	-	3 10,0%	-	19 63.3%	8 26.6%	30
15- I stress on both acknowledgment of responsibility and offer of repair strategies through explicit teaching	-	-	-	24 80.0%	6 20%	30
16- I believe that it’s necessary for EFL learners to learn all apology strategies	-	5 16.7%	-	12 40%	13 43.3%	30
17- I believe learning English means learning speech acts specifically apology	-	-	-	19 63.3%	11 36.6%	30

\*N = Number of Participants

All EFL instructors agreed with item 15 “I stress on both acknowledgment of responsibility and offer of repair strategies through explicit teaching”. The result supports the findings of the interview. Most candidates 80.0% considered responsibility tactic and offer of repair useful in explicit teaching of apology. For example, instructor 27 mentioned:

*"I believe it's necessary for learners to know how to acknowledge their fault and try to compensate it".*

Majority of the EFL instructors, (43.3 %), strongly agreed with the item 16 “I believe that it’s necessary for EFL learners to learn all apology strategies”, while 16.7 % disagreed with this idea. The result is in line with the interview part. 75% of instructors considered all apology strategies in their classes. For example, instructor 14 cited:

*"I believe that learning apology strategies are necessary for EFL learners because of dissimilarities associated to the learners' mother tongue and their culture".*

In addition, concerning item 17 “I believe learning English means learning speech acts, specifically apology” most of the contributors agreed and 36.6% of them strongly agreed. The result supports the interview part. For example, instructor 29 mentioned that:

*"one of the important aspects of language is speech act which is communicative. By learning apology speech act, learners can simply make up what they've done wrongly".*

Table 3 presents the instructors’ perceptions towards teaching speech act of apology. As displayed in table 3 below, concerning item 18 “I think the knowledge of how to use invitation speech act is necessary for EFL learners”, all contributors approved or strongly agreed with it. The result is in line with the interview part. For example, instructor 15 argued that:

*"the appropriate use of speech act may result in better communication between interlocutors. Learners must have the knowledge of using speech acts in a specific situation".*

Likewise, most of the instructors 56.6 % agreed with item 19 “I believe learners’ consciousness raising of getting information on culture and suitable language practice is more beneficial for learning invitation speech acts”, while 10.0 % disagreed with this idea. The result is in line with the findings of interview. For example, instructor 17 proposed:

*"I think improving language awareness helps learners to understand the new information. Knowledge of culture and appropriate use of language are two indispensable parts of language that affect learning speech acts".*

Item 20 “I believe instructors should teach invitation speech act when learners attain a specific level of language ability” was accepted by most EFL instructors and 43.3 % agreed, though 16.6 % disagreed. The result is in line with the result of interview part. For example, instructor 13 mentioned that:

*"I think the level of learners is an important factor in learning speech acts, I mean intermediate and advanced learners can deal with the way of teaching easily".*

When responding item 21 “I have had difficulties when teaching learners invitation speech act” most EFL instructors, 70.0% disagreed; while, 16.6 % agreed with that notion. The result of this section is in line with the interview part. For example, instructor 28 proposed that:

*"the inviter's main purpose for invitation is implied. Therefore, learner may be confused. But my learners sometimes can understand the inviter's pretense".*

**Table 3**

*Descriptive Statistics; Instructors’ Perceptions towards Teaching Speech Act of Invitation*

Questionnaire items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	N*
18- I think the knowledge of how to use invitation is necessary for EFL learners	-	-	-	24 80.0%	6 20.0%	30
19- I think learners’ consciousness raising of getting information on culture and suitable language practice is more beneficial for learning invitation	-	3 10.0%	-	17 56.6%	10 33.3%	30
20- I think instructors should teach invitation speech act when learners attain a certain level of language ability	-	5 16.7%	-	13 43.3%	12 40%	30
21- I have had difficulties when teaching learners invitation speech act	-	21 70.0%	-	5 16.6%	4 13.3%	30
22- Using genuine invitation is preferred by EFL learners	-	3 10.0%	-	25 83.3%	2 6.6%	30
23- I believe learning English means learning speech acts specifically invitation	-	-	-	18 60.0%	12 40.0%	30

\*N = Number of Participants

Regarding item 22 “using genuine invitation is preferred by EFL learners” most of the instructors 83.3 % agreed, though 10.0 % disagreed. The result supports the interview part. For example, instructor 25 mentioned that:

*"learners prefer to use genuine invitation because it is unambiguous and contains reference to time and mention of place or activity".*

In addition, with respect to item 23 “I think learning English means learning speech acts specifically invitation” 60 % of the contributors agreed. The result is in line with the interview part. For example, instructor 15 argued that:

*"teaching speech acts in classes can assist students to expand their speech acts performance and their communications with native speakers".*

**Instructors’ practices of form-focused instruction of speech acts of request, apology and invitation in EFL classes**

Table 4 below displays the methods and techniques used in teaching request, apology and invitation. As Table 4 displays, majority of the EFL instructors,

(66.66%), preferred to use general pragmatic knowledge while teaching request, apology and invitation. Results of item 1 (use of general pragmatic knowledge) are in line with item 4 of the observation (see Table 5). For example, meta-language style was used for teaching offer of repair in apology speech act by instructor 3 from NB. Likewise, most of the instructors (83.33%) stated that they prefer to use pair work when they teach the intended speech acts. The result of item 4 (use of pair work) is in line with item 1 of the observation checklist results. For example, instructor 5 from NB used pair work while teaching genuine and invitations. Awareness raising activities (item 6) are used by 83.33% of the instructors. The result is in line with item 2 of the observation. For example, instructor1 from NB used awareness raising activities when he taught direct and indirect requests.

Observation checklist data were analyzed using frequency counts. Table 5 below shows the observation scheme regarding teaching the speech act of request.

**Table 4**

*Descriptive Statistics; Methods and Techniques Used in teaching Request, Apology, and Invitation*

Items	Very much	Much	Moderate	A little	Little	N*
24- Providing the learners with general pragmatic knowledge	20 66.66%	10 33.34%	-	-	-	30
25- Using Meta-language styles	20 66.66%	10 33.3%	-	-	-	30
26-Enhancing cultural knowledge and explicit language use	25 83.33%	5 16.67%	-	-	-	30
27-Using pair work activities	25 83.33%	-	5 16.7%	-	-	30
28-Using group discussion activities	5 16.67%	25 83.33%	-	-	-	30
29-Using awareness raising activities	25 83.33%	5 16.67%	-	-	-	30

\*N = Number of Participants

**Table 5**

*Descriptive Statistics; Observation Scheme Regarding Teaching Speech Act of Request*

Items	Never	Seldom	Moderate	Much	Very Much	N
1- Learners are encouraged to do pair work through explicit strategy of teaching request	-	-	-	1 16.66	5 83.33 %	6
2- Awareness raising activities are used for direct strategy of request	-	-	-	2 33.33	4 66.67 %	6
3- Learners are encouraged to have group discussion through explicit strategy of teaching request	-	-	-	-	6 100%	6
4- Learners are provided by general pragmatic, meta-language style, cultural knowledge	-	-	-	1 16.66	5 83.33 %	6

Regarding the first item in Table 5, the majority of the instructors (83.33 %) used pair work through explicit strategy of teaching request, and based on the second item, the most of the instructors (66.7 %) used awareness raising activities, and

according to the third item, 100% of instructors used group discussion activities. Also, 83.33 % of the instructors applied meta-language style and cultural knowledge based on the last item.

Table 6 below shows the descriptive statistics with regard to observation scheme pertained to teaching speech act of invitation. Regarding the second item of Table 6, majority of the instructors (83.33 %), used awareness raising activities for

teaching invitation, and 100% of the instructors used group discussion activities. Most of the instructors (66.67 %) applied first their language cultural knowledge and then meta-language style for teaching genuine invitations.

**Table 6**  
*Descriptive Statistics; Observation Scheme Regarding Teaching Speech Act of Invitation*

Items	Never	Seldom	Moderate	Much	Very Much	N
5- Learners are encouraged to do pair work through explicit strategy of teaching genuine invitations	-	-	-		6 100%	6
6- Awareness raising activities are used for invitation	-	-	-	1 16.66	5 83.33 %	6
7- Learners are encouraged to have group discussion through explicit strategy of teaching invitation	-	-	-		6 100%	6
8- Learners are provided by general pragmatic, meta-language style & cultural knowledge for teaching invitation	-	-	-	2 33.33	4 66.67 %	6

Item 6 of the questionnaire related to the method and techniques used in the classes, supports item 2 of the observation scheme, which is related to the use of pair work and instructional practices of 83.33 % of the observed instructors which support the results of this part. In line with the results of the observation, the majority (83.7 %) of interviewees believed in using pair work as a useful way through which learners can exchange information with each other and learn better. For example, Instructor 2 from NB emphasized pair work and its advantages.

Results of item 28 of the questionnaire supports item 7 of the observation scheme, which focuses on group discussion through explicit strategies of teaching invitation. Also, majority of instructors (100%) believed in using group discussion. They believed that through using group discussion, learners could know their mistakes and weaknesses. Also, results of item 19 of the questionnaire supports item 6 of the observation scheme, which investigates ‘the effect of awareness raising activities for teaching invitation’, and instructional practices of 83.33 % of the observed instructors support results of this part; as an example Prof 3 from NB explained both genuine invitations for almost 45 minutes. He discussed different features used in genuine invitations, as well.

In addition, results of items 24 and 25 of the questionnaire related to the method and techniques support item 8 of the observation scheme, which investigates ‘the effect of meta-language style and cultural knowledge for teaching pragmatics’, and instructional practices of 66.67 % of the observed instructors support the results of this part. In line with the results of the observation, the majority (66.7 %) of interviewees believed in using

Such as, sharing ideas, developing their own understandings, and learning from each other. Also, results of item 28 of the questionnaire supports item 3 of the observation scheme, which investigates ‘the use of group discussion activities through explicit strategies of teaching request’, and instructional practices of 100% of the observed instructors support the result of this part through which learners’ confidence was increased and they could generate more ideas about the topics of group discussion.

awareness raising tasks in teaching invitation, which leads to the learners’ awareness-raising in sociocultural and sociolinguistic differences.

Table 7 below shows the descriptive statistics with regard to observation scheme pertained to teaching speech act of apology invitation. Regarding the first item in Table 7, all instructors, (100 %), used pair work through explicit strategies of teaching acknowledgment of responsibility. Also, another 100% of the instructors used group discussion activities. Majority of instructors (66.67 %) focused on the statement of the situation and explanation strategies through awareness raising activities. In addition, 66.67 % of the instructors used metalanguage style for teaching apology strategies, whereas 33.33% of the instructors applied general pragmatics knowledge.

Results of item 15 of the questionnaire supports item 9 of the observation scheme, which investigates ‘the influence of teaching acknowledgment of responsibility explicitly’, and instructional practices of 100% of the observed instructors support results of this part; as an example instructor 4 from NB explained acknowledgment of responsibility explicitly for 30 minutes.



**Table 7**

*Descriptive Statistics; Observation Scheme Regarding Teaching Pragmatic of Apology*

Items	Never	Seldom	Moderate	Much	Very Much	N
9- Learners are encouraged to do pair work through explicit strategy of teaching acknowledgment of responsibility	-	-	-	-	6 100%	6
10- Awareness raising activities are used for statement of the situation & explanation strategies	-	-	-	2 33.33	4 66.67 %	6
11- Learners are encouraged to have group discussion through explicit strategy of teaching apology	-	-	-	-	6 100%	6
12- Learners are provided by general pragmatic, meta-language style, and cultural knowledge	-	-	-	2 33.33%	4 66.67 %	6

Likewise, results of item 28 of the questionnaire supports item 11 of the observation scheme, which focuses on group discussion through explicit strategies of teaching apology. Also, majority of instructors, (100%), believed in using group discussion.

In line with the results of the observation, the majority (83.33 %) of interviewees believed in using group discussion through explicit strategies of teaching apology. They believed that group discussion helped learners more in developing the knowledge of inter-language pragmatics, and it increased their understanding of the subject. Also, the results of item 29 of the questionnaire related to method and technique supports item 10 of the observation scheme, which investigates “the impact of using awareness raising activities”, and instructional practices of 66.67 % of the observed instructors. Moreover, in line with the results of the observation, majority (66.7 %) of the interviewees believed in using explicit strategies in teaching acknowledgment of responsibility, which leads to the better understanding of the apology speech act by the learners.

## DISCUSSION

Results of the questionnaire, the quantitative phase of the study related to the first research question concerning the perceptions of the instructors towards form-focused instruction of speech acts showed that Iranian EFL instructors were presumptive in explicit teaching concerning the pragmatics of speech acts. Though, the present study did not focus on the order of attaining tactics of speech acts, it revealed that explicit meta-pragmatic education had significant effect on the understanding processes of speech acts of the learners. These findings support several studies (Arabmofrad et al., 2019; Farahian et al., 2012; Ifantidou, 2013; Ji, 2007) which have highlighted the dominant role of direct and explicit meta-pragmatic instruction of speech acts.

Furthermore, findings of the study concerning the observation scheme, and the semi-structured interview related to the second research question, the practices of instructors towards form-focused instruction of speech acts, showed that explicit and direct instruction of speech acts was mostly used by the instructors, and it was more beneficial to the realization of request, apology and invitation speech acts. Majority of instructors believed that they used awareness-raising events, pair work and group discussion activities, enhanced general pragmatic knowledge, and cultural knowledge, and used meta-language styles in their classes to teach the English language. The findings are in line with some of the previous studies (Bakhshayesh & Jafari, 2018; Rahimi Domakani & Hashemian, 2014; Tajeddin & Hosseinpur, 2014) suggesting awareness-raising for instructional tasks, specifically raising learners’ socio-pragmatic awareness and promoting their inter-language pragmatics. Also, the findings are in line with other studies such as Abdullah (2016) on the improvement of speaking skills through group discussion and Mulya (2016) on applying pair work technique to improve speaking performances.

The result of the observation and the interview regarding using form-focused instruction are in line with Al-Shammar et al. (2008), Farahian et al. (2012), and Dang and Nguyen (2013) who emphasized explicit instruction of speech acts in improving non-native learners’ achievement in English learning. Also, it is in line with Taguchi (2015) who believes that instruction on pragmatics is effective, and that explicit teaching seems more beneficial than implicit teaching.

Also, the results of observation and interview regarding using awareness-raising instructional tasks are in line with the findings of Tajeddin and Hosseinpur (2014), Zangoei and Derakhshan (2014) who suggest that awareness-raising instructional tasks could be utilized in raising learners’ socio-pragmatic awareness.

Majority of the instructors taking part in the study, focused on raising learners’ awareness on culture and appropriate language use. Learners

attain better if they understand how to use language properly. The effects of pragmatic instruction were also confirmed by the findings of previous studies (Halenko & Jones, 2011; Narita, 2012; Rezvani et al., 2014). Narita (2012) concluded that through the pragmatic consciousness raising activities, learners became aware of critical differences between L1 and L2, and enhanced their L2 pragmatic competence successfully. He mentioned that the pragmatic consciousness-raising activity is effective for L2 pragmatics acquisition.

Majority of instructors emphasized that speech acts should be taught to the learners when they gain a certain level of language proficiency. Results of this investigation support the previous study by Taguchi (2013) who found that both language proficiency and target language exposure could contribute to the development of pragmatic competence. However, the result of the present study is not in line with Rafieyan (2018) who found no correspondence between the degree of language contact and the improvement of pragmatic competence. It seems that the mere instruction of linguistic aspects of language, such as structure and vocabulary, does not equip language learners with the pragmatic aspects of language. Language learners should be trained in the pragmatic aspects of a target language, in addition to other linguistic aspects. The small correlation between level of language contact and level of pragmatic competence can be explained through the fact that the learning of pragmatic knowledge takes place in a variety of times and places both inside and outside the classroom; that this learning does not necessarily correspond to interaction with target language speakers during intensive study of language; and that some individuals have gained considerable pragmatic knowledge even before entering an intensive classroom-based study of language.

The findings of the present study revealed that there is no comprehensive method or technique for teaching pragmatics and most of the instructors made use of explicit approaches with the integration of different techniques such as pair work, group discussion, awareness raising, providing learners with general pragmatic knowledge, meta-language styles and cultural knowledge. These were the most repeated methods and techniques used by the instructors for explicit teaching of speech acts. The findings of the previous studies support the results of the present study: Abdullah (2016) conducted his research on the improvement of speaking skills through group work. The result of his research indicated that the learners responded very well to the implementation of the group work activities. Likewise, Mulya (2016) conducted her research by applying pair work technique and found that the pair work technique was an effective technique for the learners in improving their speaking performances.

The result of the interview and the observation revealed that instructors acknowledged the essential role of teaching pragmatic information and presumed that explicit instruction is more effective since this technique seems to be easier, understandable and without ambiguity for the learners.

With respect to using explicit teaching in instructing speech acts, the results are in line with some of the previous studies (Al-Shammar et al., 2008; Dang & Nguyen, 2013; Farahian et al., 2012) having highlighted the efficiency of direct and explicit teaching in improving non-native learners' achievement in the English language. It's worth noting that the approach used to teach pragmatics was a teacher-centered one, meaning that instructors directly clarified language functions to the learner. To be more specific, the study showed that more than 90% of the instructors focused on teaching pragmatic knowledge by explanations. Results are in line with Norris and Ortega (2000) who proposed that simulation activities that follow explicit instruction include description, explanation, and discussion of pragmatic features.

This study revealed that more than 80% of instructors focused on raising learners' awareness to gain information on how to use language appropriately. Raising language learners' pragmatic understanding will assist them in gaining knowledge about pragmatic features of the target language (Niezgoda & Rover, 2001). One of the key objectives of teaching pragmatics, Bardovi-Harlig and Mahan-Taylor (2003), is to increase learners' pragmatic understanding.

## **CONCLUSION**

This study sought to investigate EFL instructors' perceptions and practices towards form-focused instruction of speech acts in the Iranian context. The outcomes of the study showed that for teaching the intended speech acts of request, apology and invitation most of the instructors agreed with explicit teaching of speech acts. Likewise, most of them practiced the explicit and direct way of teaching and using pragmatic knowledge of speech acts in the classes.

The outcomes of the current study suggest a new insight towards the content of syllabi and textbooks. It assists syllabus designers, material developers and scholastic administrators particularly in EFL context to enrich the current English language teaching curricula.

The implementation of this study in its present suggested form can be justified in terms of some limitations. For instance, the researchers merely focused on EFL teachers, and only request, apology and invitation speech acts were investigated. Researchers recommend pragmatic teaching in the foreign language classes at all stages and for all

speech acts. The participants of this study were selected from English language instructors from the IAU, North Tehran Branch. Therefore, it made it a little difficult to provide a clear picture of all Iranian English language instructors' perceptions and instructional practices. Moreover, the participants of this study were selected according to criterion sampling. So, this study can be duplicated with other procedures that made the results more generalizable. Also, the number of participants was limited to 30 EFL instructors because the researcher did not have access to more instructors.

The present research just explored the teachers' perceptions and instructional practices regarding form- focused instruction of speech acts in the Iranian EFL context. Therefore, interested researchers could study the students' perceptions and instructional practices. Also, this study was conducted among a population of Iranian EFL instructors. Similarly, future research in this area could take into consideration instructors within non-Iranian contexts. Due to the limitations of the present study, this study was conducted with a limited number of instructors. The future research could consider a larger number of participants.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Authors of the current study would like to express their deepest gratitude to the colleagues of Islamic Azad University of North Tehran Branch for their kind participation in the data collection procedure.

#### REFERENCES

- Abdullah, A. (2016). Group work activities for improving speaking skill. *English Education Journal (EEJ)*, 7(3), 393.
- Alerwi, A. A., & Alzahrani, A. (2020). Using sitcoms to improve the acquisition of speech acts by EFL students: Focusing on request, refusal, apology, and compliment response. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 7(1), 63-79.
- Alinezhad, A. (2015). The Significance of Pragmatics in English Language Teaching. *'ELT Voices - India' International Journal for Teachers of English*, 5(1), 19-24.
- Al-Shammar, Z., Al-Sharoufi, H., & Yawke, T. (2008). The effectiveness of direct instruction in teaching English in elementary public education schools in Kuwait: A Research Case Study. *Education*, 129(1), 80-90.
- Amiri, M. (2019). Developing criteria for the selection of speech acts of academic situations to develop a Persian discourse completion test of inter-language pragmatics. *Proceedings of Second International Conference on Teaching Persian Language and Literature* (11 December 2019 to 13 December 2019).
- Amiri, M., & Birjandi, P. (2015). Reliability and content validity of a comprehensive discourse completion test of interlanguage pragmatics for academic situations. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 12(9), 654-659.
- Amiri, M., Birjandi, P., & Maftoon, P. (2015). Valid criteria for the selection of speech acts of academic situations to develop a comprehensive discourse completion test of interlanguage pragmatics. *Int. J. Rev. Life. Sci*, 5(5), 81-90.
- Amiri, M., & Javanshir, T. (2017). The effect of instruction type and pushed output tasks on young Iranian EFL learners' pragmatic awareness. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 7(4), 202-211.
- Ansarin, A. A., & Mohamadi, Z. (2013). Language engagement at the level of syntax: Assessing Metatalk and task types in SLA. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 2(4), 142-154. <http://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.2n.4p.142>
- Arabmofrad, A., Derakhshan, A., & Atefinejad, M. (2019). An interplay between Iranian EFL Learners' specific and general interlanguage pragmatic motivation and their meta-pragmatic awareness. *Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 1, 45-59. <https://dorl.net/dor/20.1001.1.24763187.2019.8.3.6.0>
- Aufa, F. (2013). The assessment tool of L2 learners' pragmatic competence: Written discourse completion test (WDCT). *International Proceedings of Economics Development & Research*, 68, 101-115.
- Azarmi, A., & Behnam, B. (2012). The Pragmatic Knowledge of Iranian EFL learners in using face keeping strategies in reaction to complaints at two different levels. *English Language Teaching*, 5(2), 78-92. <http://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n2p78>
- Baker, W., & Abdzadeh, Y. (2020). Global Englishes and intercultural communication: Implications for understanding and teaching pragmatics. In Z. Tajeddin & M. Alemi (Eds.), *Pragmatics pedagogy in English as an international language* (pp. 59-75). Routledge.
- Bakhshayesh, S., & Jafari, K. (2018). The effects of input enhancement and explicit instruction on developing Iranian lower-intermediate EFL learners' explicit knowledge of passive voice. *Asian-Pacific journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 3, 180-196. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-018-0060-4>
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge.

- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2018). Teaching of pragmatics. *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching*, 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0924>
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Mahan-Taylor, R. (2003). Introduction. In K. Bardovi-Harlig & R. Mahan-Taylor (Eds.), *Teaching pragmatics*. United States Department of State.
- Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization pattern (CCSARP). *Applied linguistics*, 5(3), 196-213. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/5.3.196>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In E. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Choraih, M., Loutfi, M., & Mansoor, A. (2016). The Importance of pragmatic competence in the EFL Curriculum: Application and implications. In *Proceedings of ASELS Annual Conference, 2016*, Mohammed V University of Rabat, Morocco.
- Crandall, E., & Basturkmen, H. (2004). Evaluating pragmatics-focused materials. *ELT Journal*, 58(1), 38-49. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ELT%2F58.1.38>
- Đặng, T. T. Đ., & Nguyễn, H. T. (2013). Direct versus indirect explicit methods of enhancing EFL students' English grammatical competence: A Concept checking-based consciousness-raising tasks model. *The Journal of English Language Teaching*, 6(1), 84-96. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n1p112>
- Davarzani, F., & Talebzadeh, H. (2020). The effect of virtual and real classroom instruction on inter-language pragmatic development: Microblogging versus traditional instruction of speech acts to Iranian EFL learners. *Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice*, 13(27), 72-99. <https://doi.org/10.30495/jal.2021.680904>
- DeCapua, A., & Dunham, J. F. (2007). The pragmatics of advice giving: Cross-cultural perspectives. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 4(3), 319-342.
- Dole, J. A. (2000). Explicit and implicit instruction in comprehension. In B. Taylor, M. F. Graves, & P. V. D. Broek (Eds.), *Reading for meaning: Fostering comprehension in the middle grades*, 52-69. Teachers College Press.
- Dornyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2010). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Eysenck, M. W., & Keane, M. T. (2020). *Cognitive psychology: A student's handbook*. Psychology Press.
- Ezzy, D. (2002). *Qualitative analysis: Practice and innovation*. Routledge
- Farahian, M., Rezaee, M., & Gholami, A. (2012). Does direct instruction develop pragmatic competence? Teaching refusal to EFL learners of English. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3(4), 814-821. <http://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.3.4.814-821>
- Farashaiyan, A., Sahragard, R., Muthusamy, P., & Muniandy, R. (2020). Questionnaire development and validation of interlanguage pragmatic instructional approaches & techniques in EFL contexts. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 9(2), 330-342. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v9n2p330>
- Farshi, S., & Baghbani, S. (2015). The effects of implicit and explicit focus on form on oral accuracy of EFL learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(2), 292-297. <https://doi.org/10.17507/TPLS.0502.08>
- Fordyce, K. (2014). The differential effects of explicit and implicit instruction on EFL learners' use of epistemic stance. *Applied Linguistics*, 35(1), 6-28. <http://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ams076>
- Halenko, N., & Jones, C. (2011). Teaching pragmatic awareness of spoken requests to Chinese EAP learners in the UK: Is explicit instruction effective? *System*, 39(2), 240-250. <http://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.system.2011.05.003>
- Hinkel, E. (1997). Appropriateness of advice: DCT and multiple choice data 1. *Applied Linguistics*, 18(1), 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.1093/APPLIN%2F18.1.1>
- Hmouri, Z. (2021). A study of Moroccan university EFL learners' pragmatic failure: The case of using expressive speech acts. *Studies in Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis*, 2(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.48185/spda.v2i1.191>
- Ifantidou, E. (2013). Pragmatic competence and explicit instruction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 59, 93-116. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.12.008>
- Ishihara, N. (2010). Teachers' pragmatics: Knowledge, beliefs, and practice. *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet*, 1(2), 21-36.
- Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A. D. (2014). *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet*. Routledge.
- Ji, P. (2007). *Pragmatics and pedagogy: An examination of college English training in China* [Doctoral thesis, University of Sydney].

- <https://ses.library.usyd.edu.au/handle/2123/8121>
- Kachru, B. B. (1992). Models for non-native Englishes. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed.). University of Illinois Press
- Kamarudin, K. (2020). Structured Speech Acts of Pre-Service EFL Teachers in Indonesia: Interlanguage Pragmatics. *Cordova Journal: languages and culture studies*, 10(2), 208-229. <https://doi.org/10.20414/cordova.v10i2.2901>
- Kasper, G. (2001). Classroom research on interlanguage pragmatics. In K.R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). Pragmatic development in a second language. *Language Learning*, 52(Suppl1), 1-352.
- Kondo, S. (2008). Effects on pragmatic development through awareness-raising instruction: Refusals by Japanese EFL learners. In E. A. Soler & A. Martínez-Flor (Eds.), *Investigating pragmatics in foreign language learning, teaching and testing* (pp. 153-117). Multilingual Matters.
- Krisnawati, K. (2011). Pragmatic competence in the spoken English classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 100-110.
- Malmir, A. (2021). The relationship between EFL teachers' intercultural communicative competence (ICC) and their students' pragmatic knowledge: A case of common English speech acts. *Language and Translation Studies (JLTS)*, 54(3), 181-217.
- Malmir, A., & Derakhshan, A. (2020). Identity processing styles as predictors of L2 pragmatic knowledge and performance: A case of common English speech acts. *Journal of Language Horizons*, 4(2), 187-209. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22051/lghor.2020.31583.1315>
- Martínez-Flor, A. (2005). A theoretical review of the speech act of suggesting: Towards a taxonomy for its use in FLT. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 18, 167-187. <http://doi.org/10.14198/raei.2005.18.08>
- Martínez-Flor, A., & Usó-Juan, E. (2010). The teaching of speech acts in second and foreign language instructional contexts. *Pragmatics Across Languages and Cultures*, 7, 423. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110214444.3.423>
- Martínez-Flor, A., & Usó-Juan, E. (2020). 10. Teaching speech acts in a second language. In P. Schneider & E. Ifantidou (Eds.), *Developmental and clinical pragmatics* (pp. 269-300). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110431056>
- McConachy, T. & Liddicoat, A. J. (2022). Introduction: Second language pragmatics for intercultural understanding. In T. McConachy & A. J. Liddicoat (Eds.), *Teaching and learning second language pragmatics for intercultural understanding* (pp.1-18). Routledge.
- Mulya, R. (2016). Teaching speaking by applying pair work technique. *Aceh. English Education Journal (EEJ)*, 5(1), 389.
- Narita, R. (2012). The effects of pragmatic consciousness-raising activity on the development of pragmatic awareness and use of hearsay evidential markers for learners of Japanese as a foreign language. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44, 1-29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.09.016>
- Niezgoda, K., & Rover, C. (2001). Pragmatic and grammatical awareness: A function of the learning environment? In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Norris, J., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 50, 417-528. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00136>
- Nurani, N. P. (2015). *A pragmatic analysis of classroom speech acts in the English teaching and learning process at SMA N 1 Purworejo (A Case Study)* [Bachelor thesis, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta]. [http://eprints.uny.ac.id/21258/1/A%20Thesis\\_Nurhidayah%20Permata%20Nurani\\_10202241066.pdf](http://eprints.uny.ac.id/21258/1/A%20Thesis_Nurhidayah%20Permata%20Nurani_10202241066.pdf)
- Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. D. (1990). The learning of complex speech act behavior. *TESL Canada Journal*, 7(2), 45-65. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v7i2.568>
- Patton, M. (2001). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Pishghadam, R., & Sharafaddini, M. (2011). Delving into speech act of suggestion: A case of Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2, 152-160.
- Rafieyan, V. (2018). Knowledge of formulaic sequences as a predictor of language proficiency. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 7(2), 64-69. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.7n.2p.64>
- Rahimi Domakani, M., & Hashemian, M. (2014). *Pragmatic Awareness of the request speech act in english as an additional language: Monolinguals or bilinguals?* <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339596029>.
- Rajabi, S., Azizifar, 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(3), 231-239.
- Rajabi, S., & Farahian, M. (2013). The effects of pragmatic instruction on EFL learners'

- awareness of suggestions. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 3(3), 28-38.
- Rezvani, E., Eslami-Rasekh, A., & Vahid Dastjerdi, H. (2014). Investigating the effects of explicit and implicit instruction on Iranian EFL learners' pragmatic development: Speech acts of requests and suggestions in focus. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Teaching*, 3(7), 3-14. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsl.2014.799>
- Salemi, A., Rabiee, M., & Ketabi, S. (2012). The Effects of Explicit/Implicit Instruction and Feedback on the Development of Persian EFL Learners' Pragmatic Competence in Suggestion Structures. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3(1), 188-199. <http://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.3.1.188-199>
- Savvidou, C., & Economidou-Koetsidis, M. (2019). Teaching pragmatics: Nonnative-speaker teachers' knowledge, beliefs and reported practices. *Intercultural Communication Education*, 2(1), 39-58. <http://doi.org/10.29140/ice.v2n1.124>
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129-158. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129>
- Schmidt, R. (1993). Consciousness, learning and interlanguage pragmatics. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics*. Routledge.
- Silva, A. (2003). The effects of instruction on pragmatic development: Teaching polite refusals in English. *Second Language Studies*, 22(1), 55-106.
- Soler, E. (2002). Relationship between teacher-led versus learners' interaction and the development of pragmatics in the EFL classroom. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37(3), 359-377. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-0355\(03\)00010-7](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-0355(03)00010-7)
- Soler, E., & Pitarch, J. G. (2010). The effect of instruction on learners' pragmatic awareness: A focus on refusals. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(1), 65-80. <https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes/2010/1/113981>
- Spada, N., & Fröhlich, M. (1995). *The communicative orientation of language teaching observation scheme (COLT)*. National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.
- Sykes, J. (2017). Technologies for teaching and learning intercultural competence and interlanguage pragmatics. In C. A. Chapelle & S. Sauro (Eds.). *The handbook of technology and second language teaching and learning* (pp. 118-133). <http://doi.org/10.1002/9781118914069.ch9>
- Taguchi, N. (2013). Production of routines in L2 English: Effect of proficiency and study-abroad experience. *System*, 41(1), 109-121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.01.000>
- Taguchi, N. (2015). Instructed pragmatics at a glance: Where instructional studies were, are, and should be going. *Language Teaching*, 48(1), 1-50. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444814000263>
- Tajeddin, Z., & Hosseinpur, R. (2014). The impact of deductive, inductive, and L1-based consciousness-raising tasks on EFL learners' acquisition of the request speech act. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)*, 73-92. <https://doi.org/10.22099/JTLS.2014.2022>
- Takimoto, M. (2012). Metapragmatic discussion in interlanguage pragmatics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(10), 1240-1253. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.05.007>
- Wattananukij, W., & Pongpaioj, N. (2022). Interlanguage pragmatics: An investigation of pragmatic transfer in responses to English tag questions by L1 Thai learners. *REFlections*, 29(1), 38-59.
- Young, T. J., & Walsh, S. (2010). Which english? Whose english? An investigation of 'non-native' teachers' beliefs about target varieties. *Language, culture and curriculum*, 23(2), 123-137. <http://doi.org/10.1080/07908311003797627>
- Zangoei, A., & Derakhshan, A. (2014). Iranian EFL learners' ILP comprehension and their language learning preferences: The effect of consciousness-raising instruction. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World (IJLLALW)*, 5(2), 211-232.

**APPENDICES**

**Appendix 1: Pragmatic Knowledge Questionnaire (PKQ)**

**Part 1: Demographic information** (Please tick your choice.)

1. What is your gender?  
a- Male. b- Female.
2. How long have you been teaching English?  
a- Less than 5 years. b- 5-10 years.  
c- More than 10-15 years. d- More than 15 years
3. What is the highest degree you have?  
a- Bachelor. b- Master. c- Ph.D.
4. What is your major?  
a- TEFL b- Translation
5. Did you study for your degree(s) overseas or have you had any overseas English learning experience?  
a- Yes. Which country / countries? .....  
b- No

**Part 2: Your view on English pragmatic teaching and learning.** Please make only one choice out of the five options.

1 = Strongly disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neutral 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly agree

6- I think the knowledge of how to use request is necessary for EFL learners	1	2	3	4	5
7- I think learners' consciousness raising of gaining information on culture and suitable language use is more beneficial for learning request	1	2	3	4	5
8- I believe instructors should teach request speech acts when learners attain a certain level of language ability	1	2	3	4	5
9- I teach explicit performatives of request first	1	2	3	4	5
10- I think conventionally indirect strategies challenge learners for learning request	1	2	3	4	5
11- I believe learning English means learning speech acts specifically request	1	2	3	4	5
12- I think the knowledge of how to use apology is necessary for EFL learners	1	2	3	4	5
13- I think learners' consciousness raising of getting information on culture and suitable language practice is more beneficial for learning apology	1	2	3	4	5
14- I think instructors should teach apology speech act when learners achieve a certain level of language ability	1	2	3	4	5
15- I stress on both acknowledgment of responsibility and offer of repair strategies through explicit teaching	1	2	3	4	5
16- I believe that it's necessary for EFL learners to learn all apology strategies	1	2	3	4	5
17- I believe learning English means learning speech acts specifically apology	1	2	3	4	5
18- I think the knowledge of how to use invitation is necessary for EFL learners	1	2	3	4	5
19- I think learners' consciousness raising of getting information on culture and suitable language practice is more beneficial for learning invitation	1	2	3	4	5
20- I think teachers should teach invitation speech act when learners attain a certain level of language ability	1	2	3	4	5
21- I have had difficulties when teaching learners invitation speech act	1	2	3	4	5
22- Using genuine invitation is preferred by EFL learners	1	2	3	4	5
23- I believe learning English means learning speech acts specifically invitation	1	2	3	4	5

**Part 3: Your view on English pragmatic Methods and Techniques.** Please choose only one choice out of the five options.

	Very much	Much	Moderate	A little	Little
24- Providing the learners with general pragmatic knowledge					
25- Using Meta-language styles					
26- Enhancing cultural knowledge and explicit language use					
27- Using pair work activities					
28- Using group discussion activities					
29- Using awareness raising activities					

*Adopted from Ji, 2007 & Kachru, 1992a and adapted by the researchers*

**Appendix 2: Semi Structured Interview**

1. Do you think it is important to teach students pragmatic knowledge (knowledge about how to use English appropriately)? If yes, how important is it? Can you give me an example?
- 2- What kind of request strategies do you teach first in your classes? Most direct or indirect? Please give justification for your answer.
- 3- Have you ever used suggestory strategy for teaching request construction in your classes?
- 4- Do you have any difficulties or challenges when teaching students non-conventionally indirect strategies of request?
- 5- How many apology strategies have you provided in your classes?
- 6- What type of apology strategies do you focus? Explanation or acknowledgement of responsibility? And why?
- 7- Have you ever used offer of repair strategy for teaching apology? Why?
- 8- Have you ever had any difficulties when teaching students invitation speech act? Please justify your answer.
- 9- What kind of invitation strategies do you teach first? Genuine or ostensible? And why?
- 10- If your students make a pragmatic error when they use request, invitation and apology speech acts, how would you correct it?

**Appendix 3: The Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT) Observation Scheme**

Items	Never	Seldom	Moderate	Much	Very Much	N
1- Learners are encouraged to do pair work through explicit strategy of teaching request						
2- Awareness raising activities are used for direct strategy of request						
3- Learners are encouraged to have group discussion through explicit strategy of teaching request						
4- Learners are provided by general pragmatic, metalanguage style, cultural knowledge						
5- Learners are encouraged to do pair work through explicit strategy of teaching genuine invitations						
6- Awareness raising activities are used for invitation						
7- Learners are encouraged to have group discussion through explicit strategy of teaching invitation						
8- Learners are provided by general pragmatic, metalanguage style & cultural knowledge for teaching invitation						
9- Learners are encouraged to do pair work through explicit strategy of teaching acknowledgment of responsibility						
10- Awareness raising activities are used for statement of the situation & explanation strategies						
11- Learners are encouraged to have group discussion through explicit strategy of teaching apology						
12- Learners are provided by general pragmatic, metalanguage style, and cultural knowledge						

*Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT) observation scheme by Spada & Fröhlich, 1995, adapted by the researchers*