ผลของการสอนเน้นรูปแบบต่อการพัฒนาวจนปฏิบัติศาสตร์ภาษาที่สองของผู้เรียนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาต่างประเทศ: วจนกรรมการขอร้อง

The effect of FonFs explicit pragmatic instruction on EFL learners' L2 pragmatic development: Requesting

สิริกัญญา วรชิน [1] และ อังคณา ทองพูน พัฒนศร[2]

Sirikanya Worachin[1] and Angkana Tongpoon-Pattanasorn[2]

บทคัดย่อ

ปัจจุบันนอกเหนือจากการพัฒนาทักษะทั้งสี่ในการสอนภาษาอังกฤษแล้ว นักวิจัยทางด้านภาษายังให้ความสนใจในการพัฒนาวจนปฏิบัติศาสตร์ภาษาที่สองอีกด้วย ดังนั้นงานวิจัยนี้จึงมีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อทดสอบผลของการสอนเน้นรูปแบบในการพัฒนาวจนปฏิบัติศาสตร์ภาษาที่สองของผู้เรียนชาวไทยที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาต่างประเทศผ่านวจนกรรมการขอร้องเครื่องมือที่ใช้ในการวิจัย คือ บทบาทสมมติเกี่ยวกับการขอร้อง จำนวน 6 สถานการณ์ ข้อสอบไวยากรณ์แบบเลือกตอบและแบบสอบถามเพื่อประเมินความพึงพอใจของผู้เรียนที่มีต่อการสอนเน้นรูปแบบ กลุ่มตัวอย่างในงานวิจัยนี้คือ นักศึกษาสาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษธุรกิจที่ศึกษาอยู่ในมหาวิทยาลัยแห่งหนึ่ง จำนวน 10 คน สถิติที่ใช้ในการวิเคราะห์ข้อมูล คือ a Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test ร้อยละ ค่าเฉลี่ย และส่วนเบี่ยงเบนมาตรฐาน ผลการวิจัยพบว่าการสอนเน้นรูปแบบสามารถพัฒนาความรู้ด้านวจนปฏิบัติศาสตร์ภาษาที่สองของผู้เรียนได้อย่างมีประสิทธิภาพ นอกจากนี้ผลจากการตอบแบบสอบถามพบว่า ผู้เรียนมีทัศนคติที่ดีต่อการสอนเน้นรูปแบบ ข้อเสนอแนะจากผลการวิจัยพบว่าในการพัฒนาวจนปฏิบัติศาสตร์ภาษาที่สองของผู้เรียนควรมีการสอนลักษณะทางไวยากรณ์ควบคู่กับรูปแบบการใช้ภาษาเพื่อให้การเรียนการสอนภาษาเป็นไปอย่างมีประสิทธิภาพ

Keywords: วจนปฏิบัติศาสตร์ระหว่างภาษา, การสอนเน้นรูปแบบ, วจนกรรมการขอร้อง

Abstract

Nowadays, apart from developing the four skills in English language instruction, researchers in language realms have also been interested in the development of second language pragmatics (L2 pragmatics) or interlanguage pragmatics (ILP). Therefore, the present study aimed to examine the effects of FonFs explicit pragmatic instruction on the development of Thai EFL learners' Interlanguage Pragmatics (ILP) in the speech act of requesting. Research instruments included six role-play situations, the multiple-choice grammar test, and an attitude questionnaire. The participants of the study were ten Business English major students in a university. The statistics used in this study consisted of a Wilcoxon Signed-Rank test, as well as frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation. The results revealed that FonFs explicit pragmatic instruction

---

[1] นักศึกษาหลักสูตรปรัชญาดุษฎีบัณฑิต สาขาวิชาภาษาศาสตร์ประยุกต์ มหาวิทยาลัยขอนแก่น อีเมล: s.worachin@gmail.com

[2] รองศาสตราจารย์ ดร., คณะมนุษยศาสตร์และสังคมศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยขอนแก่น

[1] Ph.D. student in Applied Linguistics, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Khonkaen University,
   Email: s.worachin@gmail.com

[2] Associate Professor in Applied Linguistics, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Khonkaen University,

could improve EFL learners'L2 pragmatics. In addition, the participants had positive attitudes towards FonFs explicit pragmatic instruction. The suggestion from the results of the study recommends that teaching interlanguage pragmatics should include both related grammatical features and pragmatic features.

Keywords: Interlanguage pragmatic, FonFs explicit pragmatic instruction, Requesting

Introduction

Since the early 1980s, the field of second language (L2) pragmatics education has grown in popularity as a result of research demonstrating its teachability, resulting in the contemporary understanding of how to teach this aspect of language effectively (Taguchi, 2011a). Meanwhile, the field has widened to encompass various features, including routines (House, 1996; Tateyama et al., 1997), hedging devices (Barraja-Rohan, 2011; Wishnoff, 2000), and speech acts (Fukuya & Clark, 2001; Kondo, 2008; Martinez-Flor & Fukuya, 2005; Pearson, 2006; Takahashi, 2001; Takimoto, 2006a, 2006b, 2008; Tateyama, 2009).

Meanwhile, various second language acquisition (SLA) theories have been used to denote the processes and outcomes of pragmatic instruction, including explicit and implicit learning (Alcón-Soler, 2005; Rose & Ng, 2001; Takimoto, 2008), processing instruction (Takimoto, 2009), noticing and consciousness-raising theories (Kondo, 2008; Takahashi, 2001), form-focused instruction (Fukuya & Zhang, 2002; Martinez-Flor & Fukuya, 2005), and sociocultural theories (Van Compernolle & Williams, 2012a, 2012b). Among these subjects, the outcomes of explicit and implicit instruction have garnered considerable attention (Li, 2013).

Explicit instruction is a structured method of teaching that focuses on proceeding in small steps, testing for student comprehension, and ensuring that all students participate effectively and successfully (Rosenshine, 1987). During explicit teaching, students' attention is drawn to specific linguistic features and how they are perceived in different contexts.

Most previous studies of interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) instruction found that explicit instruction is effective in improving learners' L2 pragmatics (e.g., Eslami-Rasekh & Mardani, 2010; Ghraibeh, Mirzaee & Yaghoubi-Notash, 2016; Halenko, 2016; Irshad & Bukhar, 2020; Liu, 2007; Mirzaei & Esmaeili, 2013; Mohammed, 2012; Rajabia et al., 2015; Safont-Jorda, 2004; Silva, 2003; Vellenga, 2008). For example, Eslami-Rasekh and Mardani (2010) found that explicit instruction can enhance EFL learners' apology strategies. Similarly, a study by Gharibeh et al. (2016) showed that explicit instruction facilitates EFL learners' ability to perform the speech act of refusal. Investigating Halenko's (2016) study, the results revealed that explicit pragmatic instruction plays a positive role in improving the pragmatic speaking competence of Chinese ESL learners in the UK. According to Irshad and Bukhar (2020), explicit pragmatic instruction is necessary for the pragmatic competence of Pakistani learners of English. Likewise, Liu (2007) found that explicit pragmatic instruction has a positive effect on Taiwanese EFL learners' ability to make requests. Mohammed (2012) examined the effect of explicit instruction on the development of Iraqi EFL learners' pragmatic competence. The results revealed that explicit instruction plays a positive role in improving learners' requests and refusals. In a similar fashion, Mirzaei and Esmaeili (2013) found that explicit instruction can facilitate the development of pragmatically

appropriate use and interpretation of language. According to Rajabia et al.'s (2015) study, explicit instruction facilitates EFL learners' apology strategies in different situations. In a study by Safont-Jorda (2004), explicit instruction was shown to have a positive effect on participants' use of request strategies. In addition, the results of Silva's (2003) and Vellenga's (2008) studies showed that explicit instruction can enhance learners' pragmatic ability to perform speech acts in the L2.

While previous studies have looked into the effects of explicit pragmatic instruction on interlanguage development, few investigations have been carried out to study the role of grammar teaching or focus on forms (FonFs) on L2 pragmatic development. This may be due to the minimal role of grammatical teaching in pragmatic instruction. In other words, the effect of grammar teaching on pragmatic development is not clearly seen. Previous literature has shown that FonFs can help learners directly attend to linguistic forms. In a FonFs class, learners are provided with opportunities to use target features in controlled exercises and engage in tasks requiring them to notice and use these features (Ellis et. al., 2002). A previous study by Nguyen et al. (2012) evaluated the relative effectiveness of implicit and explicit form-focused instruction on Vietnamese English learners' acquisition of the set of speech acts that comprise constructive criticism in writing. In their study, the explicit group was given consciousness-raising activities and taught both pragmatic and meta-pragmatic forms of the set of speech acts, whereas the implicit group was given pragma linguistic input enhancement and recast activities without being taught any forms of constructive criticism. The control group did not receive any activities or treatment. The results showed that both the explicit and implicit groups improved on the immediate post-test and the delayed post-test and outperformed the control group.

This study shed some light on the role of explicit teaching of grammar on L2 pragmatic development. However, it did not systemically teach the specific grammar features of constructive criticism and the effect of grammatical instruction on pragmatic development is not clearly understood. With a clearer sense of how grammatical features are integrated into ILP instruction, it is possible to better understand the role grammar plays in second pragmatic development. Finally, none of the previous studies examined the roles of FonFs or grammar teaching in ILP or included Thai participants, especially in the speech act of requests. Effective requests are required for successful communication to occur and to create good relationships. It is well documented that language learners and even native speakers struggle with making effective requests even simple ones (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984). Therefore, the purposes of this study are to examine the effects of explicit pragmatic instruction and FonFs on two aspects of Thai EFL learners' L2 pragmatics in the speech act of requesting (i.e., pragmatic appropriateness and linguistic accuracy) and to examine EFL learners' opinions on the explicit pragmatic instructions and FonFs.

Objectives

1. To examine the effect of FonFs explicit pragmatic instruction on improving Thai EFL learners' L2 pragmatics.

2. To examine opinions of Thai EFL learners on improving L2 pragmatic development through the FonFs explicit pragmatic instruction

Literature Review

This section reviews previous literature related to this research.

1. Explicit instruction

Interventional research on pragmatic development has included studies comparing instruction to no instruction or pure stimulus, teachability studies, and studies comparing various teaching methods. In a review of the relevant literature, Rose (2005) discovered that general pragmatic features are teachable and instruction can lead to pragmatic development. Nonetheless, it is unknown which real-world teaching approach yields the best results.

Explicit instruction is a structured method of teaching that emphasizes taking small steps, testing student comprehension, and ensuring that all students participate effectively and successfully (Rosenshine, 1987). Students' attention is drawn to specific linguistic features and how they are perceived in different contexts.

Those who advocate for explicit pragmatic instruction assert that it aids EFL learners in developing a pragmatic understanding of target speech acts by directing their attention to specific forms. Explicit instruction is based on Schmidt's (1993) noticing hypothesis, which suggests that learners should pay conscious attention to pragmatic information in the L2 rather than simply being exposed to pragmatic-rich input. A focus on forms is facilitated by explicit instruction that emphasizes pragmatic aspects. While learners' attention is activated by pragmatic instruction, they do not immediately incorporate pragmatic features into their own language use (Alcon, 2005; Gholamia & Aghaib, 2012; Martinez-Flor & Alcon, 2007).

2. Focus on forms instruction

Focus on forms (FonFs) instruction is a method of teaching that focuses on presenting discrete points of grammar in isolated lessons based on a structured syllabus (Long, 1991). According to Wilkins (1976), this instruction takes what is called a syntactic approach to syllabus design. As such, it is aimed at teaching specific grammatical structures, similar to traditional grammar instruction (Farrokhi & Talabari, 2011). FonFs focuses on learning through a conscious process (Schmidt, 1995), which takes place through explicit discussion and assimilation of rules. FonFs learners attend directly to linguistic forms, isolated from meaning.

In this approach, the learner's role is to integrate the forms into their L2 communication. The created syllabi, along with corresponding materials, methodology, and classroom pedagogy, leads to form-centered instruction. Pedagogical elements, accompanied by classroom strategies, are designed to demonstrate and help learners practice a collection of linguistic items or forms (Celik, 2016; Doughty & Williams, 1998; Spada & Lightbown, 2008). Designed for the benefit of learners, FonFs instruction follows a sequence of "presentation of a grammatical structure, its practice in controlled exercises, and the provision of opportunities for production—or PPP" (Ellis, 2001; Ellis et al., 2002).

3. Speech act of requesting

Requesting, a type of directive, is a speech act that conveys a desire that the hearer performs an act that benefits the speaker (Trosborg, 1995). According to Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984), requesting is always a pre-event act carried out in an attempt to cause an event to happen or change the way it happens. Grammatical structures used in this act are supportive moves (adjunct to head acts), interrogatives (yes/no

questions), gerund forms, negations, past tense, and embedded "if" clauses (adapted from Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984).

Making requests is one of the most challenging speech acts for students, as it requires a high degree of efficacy and appreciable capability in terms of cultural and linguistic sensitivities (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984). For example, in view of the imposition of a request, indirect methods should be employed appropriately according to cultural norms and the situational context. As such, learners should consider the cultural differences between their first language and the target language when expressing requests.

As a form of speech act that has triggered the interest of many researchers in ILP studies (Fukushima, 2003), speech acts of requesting have been examined in terms of how they are produced, how language learners apply them in different contexts, and how they can be taught in pedagogical settings. One example of collaborative research at the international level on this topic and related issues is the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP). The most common approach to analyzing data among CCSARP studies is the use of coding schemes (Rajabia et al., 2015).

Previous studies on this subject can be classified into two groups: interlanguage studies and cross-cultural research. Interlanguage studies center on language learners' development of the target language (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Hassall, 1997, 2001; Svanes, 1992; Takahashi & DuFon, 1989). Cross-cultural studies, meanwhile, are centered on comparisons between native and non-native speakers' output (Cenoz & Valencia, 1996; Chiravate, 2011; Kogetsidis, 2008; Wei, 2012).

Methodology

This section outlines the research methodology adopted in this study.

1. Population and sample group

The population in this study were Thai EFL learners studying English at the tertiary level. Initially, the sample group of this study included sixteen second-year Thai EFL university students majoring in Business English and enrolled in the 15-week "Business English 2" course in the first semester of 2020. They were selected using a convenience sampling method. However, some participants decided to drop out during the data collection process or did not take both the pre-test and the post-test. Therefore, the number of participants who participated in all measures was ten (n = 10).

2. Instruments

The measuring instruments used in this study were role-play tasks, a grammar test, and an attitude questionnaire.

A role-play task was used as a pre-test and post-test in the present study. The task required the participants to supply participate in six open-ended role-play situations involving the speech act of requesting and corresponding pragmatic judgments. The six contexts were selected according to the results of a pilot study using Hudson, Detmer, and Brow's (1995) framework, i.e., university students' familiarity and circumstances around the university. The six open-ended role-play situations included in the classroom, in the cafeteria, in the teachers' room, at the market, at the milk shop, and at their friends' apartment.

The situations for the speech act varied in accordance with social status and social distance (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Social status or relative power refers to "the ability of one person to apply their will to another" (Brown & Levinson, 1987). It is a non-reciprocal relationship between at least two individuals, in the sense that neither has control in the same area of action. According to Han (2013), social status or power can be divided into three categories: high, equal, and low. High means the addressee has more power than the speaker, equal means the addressee and the speaker have parallel status and low means the addressee has less power than the speaker.

In terms of social distance, the degree of familiarity of the interlocutors was expressed and divided into two types: familiar and unfamiliar (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Han (2013) classifies social distance into three dimensions: intimate, acquaintance, and stranger. Intimate means the interlocutors know each other very well, acquaintance means the interlocutors are familiar with each other, and stranger means the interlocutors do not know each other. Consequently, in the present study, three levels of social status (high, equal, and low) and three levels of social distance (stranger, acquaintance, and intimate) were considered when developing pragmatic situations for the speech act of requesting.

An example of a role-play situation is shown in Figure 1.

Requesting speech act (equal social status and acquaintance social distance)

You are a university student. You left your class notes in your dormitory. You need to borrow You classmate's notebook. *What would you say?:*

You are a university student and A's classmate. You can lend A you class notes. *You accept her*

Figure 1 Example role-play situation

The data from the role-play questions were scored on two measures (accuracy and appropriateness) by two raters: a native speaker and the first author of the study using the following rubric (see Table 1). Prior to the scoring, the native speaker was trained how to use the scoring rubric. When there were disagreements in score assignments, the raters discussed to arrive at consensuses. After the training, the two raters rated all answers separately. The inter-rater reliability between the two raters using Cohen's Kappa showed a strong correlation of 0.93, or 93 percent of agreement.

Rubrics for scoring second learners' requests on appropriateness and accuracy is shown in Table 1

Table 1 Rubrics for scoring second learners' requests on appropriateness and accuracy from six-role
play situations

Pragmatic appropriateness (2 points)	
Score of 2	Appropriate responses contain the following characteristics: Responses are completely relevant to the given situation and the interlocutor's responses. The participants use all appropriate pragmatic forms for expressing requests by considering two factors : social status and social distance.
Score of 1	Acceptable responses contain one or all of following characteristics: Impromper amount information (too little information) Responses are somewhat relevant to the given situations and the interlocutor's responses. The participants use some inappropriate pragmatic forms for expressing requests by considering two factors : social status and social distance.
Score of 0	Unacceptable responses contain the following characteristics: No response Responses are irrelevant to the given situations and the interlocuter's responses.
Grammar accuracy (2 points)	
Score of 2	Appropriate answers contain the following characteristics: The use of specific grammar features is fully appropriate for expressing requests. The participants utilize accurate grammatical features of requesting.
Score of 1	Acceptable responses contain one or all of following characteristics: The participants utilize some grammatical errors which do not affect the understanding, and/or responses reflect the situations clearly or dialogue completely. The participants utilize some grammatical errors which change a speaker's meaning and intention, and/or responses call for some interpretation.
Score of 0	Unacceptable responses contain the following characteristics: No response No use of grammatical features for expressing requests. The participants use some grammatical errors that often cause confusion/misinterpretation. The participants have serious trouble using grammatical structures that often do not make sense.

The RERU Grammar Test was employed in the present study to evaluate the increase in learners' grammatical knowledge. It comprises 20 multiple-choice items containing different specific grammar features used in the speech act of requesting. These different grammatical forms were obtained and developed based on 1) speech act theories (Austin, 1962); 2) the Classification of Elocutionary Acts (Searle, 1976); 3) previous ILP studies focusing on requesting, as well as various movie scripts containing requests. The test was checked for content validity by using Item-Objective Congruence and the reliability using Kuder-Richardson 20; all tests show acceptable content validity of over 0.5 and strong reliability of 0.87.

An attitude questionnaire was developed and employed to obtain learners' opinions on the effect of explicit pragmatic instruction and grammar teaching on L2 pragmatic development. The questionnaire asked participants about their attitudes towards enhanced explicit pragmatic instruction using a five-point rating scale.

3. Instructional material

The instructional material was designed to teach the speech act of requesting and the grammatical features used in the process. Each lesson for the enhanced explicit pragmatic instruction and FonFs group (EPI) had three parts: presentation, practice, and production (PPP), as well as a wrap-up session. To explicitly teach the speech act of requesting and related grammatical features, the PPP model was adopted.

In the presentation stage, learners were given input and awareness-raising activities. During the input stage, participants were shown a video clip of the speech act of requesting. The teacher then quizzed the students on the sentences and expressions used in the video clip. Following this, the participants were explicitly taught various request structures and grammatical forms. During the awareness-raising activities, they were given scripts of the situations and asked to identify the formulas and strategies used by the characters to make requests.

In the practice stage, the participants were given four exercises. The first was a matching exercise. In this exercise, students had to match grammatical features with the appropriate pragmatic expressions. Following this, the teacher explained the rules of the specific grammar features in the exercise. Second, they were given a pragmatic expression completion exercise: a short dialogue with some blank spaces. They were then asked to complete the missing pragmatic features of the speech act with appropriate expressions. Options were provided. Students then worked in groups to practice the completed dialogue. Afterwards, they were given an ordering exercise, in which they had to order speech act expressions. The teacher then asked them individually to check their answers. Finally, they were asked to discuss the factors influencing their choices, such as social status, social distance, and context, as well as the differences and similarities in how requests are made in Thai and English-speaking cultures.

In the production stage, learners were asked to perform role-play scenarios based on the speech act of requesting in pairs and groups, using various social roles and contexts, in order to assess the development of their knowledge. The teacher provided explicit feedback on both pragmatic appropriateness and grammatical accuracy during the wrap-up session. Learners were given the opportunity to ask questions about both pragmatic and linguistic features. They were also asked to consider how they could improve their requests and sum up what they had learned in this lesson. To prepare for the next class meeting, homework was assigned.

4. Data Collection

The data were collected in the second semester of the 2020 academic year. First, in the first week, the participants were given open role-play tasks (ORPTs) and a multiple-choice RERU grammar pre-test to examine their L2 pragmatic skills and grammatical knowledge. Second, the participants received FonFs explicit pragmatic instruction treatment for three weeks. The participants were taught lessons about the specific pragmatic and grammatical features of the speech act. After the treatment, the participants took part in a post-test session including open role-play tasks (ORPTs) and a multiple-choice RERU grammar test to determine their pragmatic and linguistic development. Finally, immediately after the post-test, the participants were asked to complete an attitude questionnaire to evaluate their opinions about and satisfaction with FonFs explicit pragmatic instruction in terms of improving their L2 pragmatics.

5. Data Analysis

The data were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. The quantitative analysis comprised a Wilcoxon Signed-Rank test, as well as frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation. Qualitative and content analyses were also used to answer the research questions. Due to the small number of participants (n = 10), which did not meet the requirements of inferential statistics, a non-parametric test (i.e., Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test) was used to examine the participants' development in pragmatic appropriateness, linguistic accuracy, and grammatical knowledge. Qualitative analysis was conducted to determine how the participants acquired these abilities after the treatment.

Results

Effects of FonFs Explicit Pragmatic Instruction on Requesting

The results of the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test indicated that the median score of pragmatic appropriateness on the post-test (Mdn = 10.00) was statistically significantly higher than on the pre-test (Mdn = 6.00, $Z = -2.530$, $p = .011 < .05$; see Table 2). Therefore, after enhanced explicit pragmatic instruction (i.e., FonFs), the participants made more appropriate requests in consideration of social status and social distance.

Table 2 Pragmatic appropriateness pre- and post-test scores of EPI group

Pragmatic appropriateness	Median	Z	P
Pretest	6		
Posttest	10	-2.530	.011

The results also indicated that the median score of linguistic accuracy on the post-test (Mdn = 11.00) was statistically significantly higher than on the pre-test (Mdn = 8.50, $Z = -2.692$, $p = .007 < .05$). The significance level implies that the participants correctly used relevant linguistic features to make requests (see Table 3.)

Table 3 Linguistic accuracy pre- and post-test scores of EPI group

Linguistic accuracy	Median	Z	P
Pretest	8.50		
Posttest	11	-2.692	.007

Based on the qualitative analysis, before the treatment the participants mainly used modal verbs (e.g., can, could, and may) as request strategies in all situations, regardless of power or social distance: *Can I borrow your battery charger?, Could you move your car, please?,* and *May I come in, please?* In addition, it was found that they used direct requests and commands, such as *Please put your dish to the washing area* and *Take the dish to the washing area now*. After the treatment, the participants used more varied options to make requests in addition to these approaches, such as *Do you mind if I...?, Do you think you could...?, Is it okay if...?, Would you..., please?, Would you mind if I...?, Excuse me, would you...?, It would be nice if...,* and *I request you to...* Also, they seemed to use longer requests including reasons or explanations. For example, in Situation 5, which took place at a shop where the interlocutors were acquaintances and the speaker had less power, in the pre-test, the requests they produced were quite short and direct (e.g., *You give me wrong changes and I think you give me wrong changes*). In the post-test, participants added reasons or explanations, such as *Excuse me. I don't know if you made the wrong changes or not. Could you check, please?* and *Excuse me. Can you check the price again? I think this is wrong change.* After the treatment, the participants also produced more appropriate requests. For example, in Situation 4—which took place in a parking lot, the interlocutors were strangers, and the recipient had a high social status—in the pre-test, the expressions used were *Could you move your car, please?* and *Can you move your car?* In the post-test, participants attempted to be more polite by using forms of requesting such as *Excuse me. Could you move your car a little, please? Would you move your car, please?* and *Do you mind moving your car a little?*

Detailed analyses of pragmatic appropriateness and linguistic accuracy showed interesting findings. As shown in Table 4, the participants showed high pragmatic appropriateness and linguistic accuracy (100%) on the pre-test for Situation 1 and Situation 3. In other words, all participants knew how to make appropriate and accurate requests in Situations 1 and 3 before receiving enhanced explicit pragmatic and grammar instruction. However, on the pre-test, the participants had the least knowledge in Situation 4. Only half of the participants were able to appropriately and accurately request something from an interlocutor who was an acquaintance with high social status.

After the treatment, in Situation 3, 70% of the students used the same pragmatic features as in the pre-test. That means, despite being taught, students did not use new pragmatic features in this situation. However, 70% of the participants used newly-taught pragmatic features (both appropriateness and grammatical features) in Situations 2 and 4. Furthermore, 30% of the participants used new expressions in Situation

5 without being taught. The findings also showed that several participants used grammatical features of requesting without being taught in Situations 2, 3, 5, and 6 (10%, 20%, 20%, and 20%, respectively).

Table 4   Requesting pragmatic appropriateness and linguistic accuracy of the EPI group

Situations	Pretest		Post Test					
	Appropriateness 100%	Grammar 100%	Appropriateness (100%)			Grammar (100%)		
			Same	New from being taught	New without being taught	Same	New from being taught	New without being taught
1 Equal/acquaintance	100%	100%	60%	30%	10%	70%	30%	-
2 Low/stranger	70%	70%	10%	70%	10%	10%	70%	10%
3 High/acquaintance	100%	100%	70%	10%	20%	70%	10%	20%
4 High/ stranger	50%	50%	-	70%	10%	-	80%	-
5 Low/acquaintance	80%	80%	10%	50%	30%	10%	60%	20%
6 Equal /intimate	90%	90%	40%	40%	20%	50%	30%	20%

Effects of FonFs Explicit Instruction on Grammatical Knowledge

To examine the participants' grammatical knowledge, their scores on the RERU grammar pre-test and post-test were analyzed using a Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test. The results indicated that the median post-test grammar score (Mdn = 15.50) was statistically significantly higher than on the pre-test (Mdn = 8.00, Z = -2.825, $p < .005$; see Table 5). As such, the participants had more grammatical knowledge after receiving explicit pragmatic instruction and grammar teaching.

Table 5 Grammar pre- and post-test scores of EPI group

Grammar Test	Median	Z	P
Pretest	8.00		
Posttest	15.50	-2.825	.005

Learners' Opinions on the FonFs Explicit Pragmatic Instruction

The results of the questionnaire showed that the participants had positive opinions about the FonFs explicit pragmatic instruction. Even though they identified that the learning activities were quite challenging for them (M = 4.08, S.D. = 1.08), they thought this form of instruction could effectively improve their L2 pragmatics (mean = 4.75, S.D. = 0.66). In addition, they reported that they were highly motivated to learn when instructed in this manner (M = 4.75, S.D. = 0.62). A post hoc analysis was conducted to category answers of seven participants from ten participants to the open-ended questions into groups based on four major areas: the importance of the teaching of interlanguage pragmatic and grammar instruction, its usefulness, learners' pragmatic improvement through the integrated pragmatic-grammar instruction, and improvement of EFL learners' grammatical knowledge through this teaching method (see Table 6). According to Table 6, the participants viewed that teaching and learning grammar in pragmatic instruction was helpful because it could help improve their second language pragmatic, grammatical knowledge, general English language ability, and surprisingly business writing. They also viewed that the FonF explicit pragmatic instruction, due to the teacher's explanation of related grammatical points, could help improve their grammatical knowledge and ability to use more various request strategies appropriate to different situations.

Table 6 EFL learners' opinions on the FonFs Explicit Pragmatic Instruction and Pragmatic and Grammar
Development

Item	Categories	Frequency
1. Importance of the teaching of interlanguage pragmatics and grammar instruction.	- for EFL learners' communication in daily life.	2
	- for Improving general English proficiency.	2
	importance for future careers.	1
	- for understanding the cultures of native speakers	1
	- for writing business letters.	1
2. Usefulness of the learning of interlanguage pragmatics and grammar	- Better understanding of both pragmatic strategies and grammatical structures and how to make requests in different situations.	6
3. Improvement of learners' pragmatic knowledge through the teaching of interlanguage pragmatics and grammar instruction.	- Ability to use different pragmatic strategies to make requests.	7
4. Improvement of learners' grammatical knowledge through the teaching of interlanguage pragmatics and grammar instruction.	- Better understanding of different grammatical structures and of how to use them after learning via the FonFs explicit pragmatic instruction.	7

Discussion

       This study aimed to investigate the effect of explicit pragmatic instruction and FonFs on the development of EFL learners' L2 pragmatics. The result of the study showed that participants' pragmatic knowledge (i.e., pragmatic appropriateness and linguistic accuracy) and grammatical knowledge increased after the treatment. Also, the participants show positive attitudes toward the FonFs explicit pragmatic instruction. Therefore, explicit pragmatic instruction with FonFs teaching, including explicit and systematic grammar teaching, plays a positive role in L2 learners' pragmatic development. The results were in line with previous studies on the roles of explicit pragmatic instruction on second pragmatic development (Eslami-Rasekh & Mardani, 2010; Gharibeh et al., 2016; Halenko, 2016; Irshad & Bukhar, 2020; Liu, 2007; Mirzaei & Esmaeili, 2013; Mohammed, 2012; Rajabia et al., 2015; Safont-Jorda, 2004, Silva, 2003; Vellenga, 2008, Xiao-le, 2011). Moreover, in our further investigation of the pragmatic appropriateness and linguistic accuracy of participants' requests in different situations, we found that L2 learners were able to accurately and appropriately use the pragmatic features and grammatical features that had been explicitly taught.

According to Rosenshein (1987) and Aufa (2011), explicit instruction is a structured method of instruction that emphasizes taking small steps, assessing student comprehension, and ensuring that all students participate effectively and successfully. Additionally, in this study's explicit teaching of pragmatics and FonFs, pragmatic features were presented, practiced, and produced in a systematic manner. Production activities required learners to perform requests in a variety of scenarios, with interlocutors at varying levels of social status, social distance, and degrees of imposition. One of the most salient features of this study's explicit pragmatic instruction is that the grammatical features associated with the speech act were taught explicitly and systematically. According to Takahashi (2010), when students are instructed explicitly, their attention is drawn to specific linguistic characteristics, which are then interpreted and learned in context. This may aid participants in comprehending and accurately employing pragmatic and linguistic features. The findings reveal the important role of the systematic teaching of grammatical features associated with speech acts.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to examine the effect of explicit instruction on interlanguage pragmatic development and how the pragmatic appropriateness, linguistic accuracy, and grammatical knowledge of L2 learners can be improved. The findings indicated that explicit pragmatic instruction using FonFs in the form of systematic grammar teaching can lead to the improvement of EFL learners' L2 pragmatics. The quantitative findings should be interpreted with caution due to the study's small sample size; however, the qualitative findings yielded important results concerning L2 learners' pragmatic development in terms of quality, forms, and appropriateness. Future studies that include more participants and examine different speech acts will be able to shed more light on L2 pragmatic development and instruction. In addition, the role of the systematic teaching of grammatical features associated with targeted speech acts should be further studied and confirmed.

When learning a second language, it is critical to develop pragmatic knowledge and competence alongside the four language skills, vocabulary, and grammar. While the importance of ILP in L2 learning has been recognized, it seems that pragmatic instruction still plays a minor role in classroom English language instruction. With data from future research in this area, teachers will be better informed about how L2 pragmatics can be developed through appropriate instruction.

Limitations and suggestions for future studies

1. There were only ten participants in this study. Future research should include a large number of participants. With a larger sample group, the findings from the quantitative results can be more generalizable.

2. This study was a small-scale study and it was conducted with learners majoring in Business English, the application of the results of the study should be cautious. Also, it is also interesting to learn about the effect of the FonFs explicit pragmatic instruction in other groups of learners, who are non-English major.

3. This study examined only the immediate effect of FonFs explicit pragmatic instruction on second language learners' pragmatics. It did not examine the retention. As such, with the delayed posttest, the effect of FonFs explicit pragmatic instruction on second language learners' pragmatic knowledge will be better understood.

4. Investigation on effects of grammar teaching on the development of interlanguage pragmatic have not been extensively conducted. More studies are needed to be conducted to further examine the effect and role of grammar teaching on second language learners' interlanguage pragmatic development.

References

Alcón-Soler, E. (2005). Does instruction work for learning pragmatics in the EFL context?. *System,* 33(3), 417–435.

Aufa, F. (2011). Explicit pragmatic instruction in teaching English as a foreign language. *Journal of English and Education,* 5(1), 37-44.

Austin, J. (1962). How to do things with words?. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Barraja-Rohan, A.M. (2011). Using conversation analysis in the second language classroom to teach interactional competence. *Language Teaching Research*, 15, 479-507.

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

Blum-Kulka, S. and Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistic*, 5(3), 196-213.

Celik, B. (2016). Comparing the Effectiveness of Form-Focused and Meaning-Focused Instructions in EFL Teaching. *Journal of Education in Black Sea Region*, 1(1), 5-15.

Cenoz, J. and Valencia, J. F. (1996). Cross-cultural communication and interlanguage pragmatics: American vs. European requests. In L.F Bouton (Ed.). *Pragmatic and Language Learning*. USA: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Chiravate, B. (2011). Perception of politeness in English requests by Thai EFL learners. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies,* 17(2), 59-71.

Doughty, C. and Williams, J. (1998). Pedagogical choices in focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.). *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (2001). Introduction: Investigating form-focused instruction. *Language Learning*, 51(Supplement 1), 1-46.

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., and Loewen, S. (2002). Doing focus on form. *System,* 30, 419-432.

Eslami-Rasekh, A., and Mardani, M. (2010). Investigating the effects of teaching apology speech act, with a focus on intensifying strategies, on pragmatic development of EFL learners: The Iranian context. *The International Journal of Language Society and Culture*, 30, 96-103.

Farrokhi, F. and Talabari, F.A. (2011). Focus on form instruction in EFL: Implications for theory and practice. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning,* 53(222), 29-47.

Fukushima, S. (2003). *Requests and culture: Politeness in British English and Japanese (3rd printing)*.Bern: Peter Lang.

Fukuya, Y. and Clark, M. (2001). A comparison of input enhancement and explicit instruction of mitigators. In L. Bouton (Ed.). *Pragmatics and language learning.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Fukuya, Y.J. and Zhang, Y. (2002). Effects of recasts on EFL learners' acquisition of pragmalinguistics conventions of request. *Second Language Studies,* 21(1), 1-47.

Ghraibeh. S. G, Mirzaee, M. and Yaghoubi-Notash, M. (2016). The role of instruction in the development of EFL learners' pragmatic competence. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 3(2), 173-184.

Gholamia, J. and Aghaib, H.K. (2012). The impact of explicit and implicit instruction on Iranian EFL learners' production and recognition of language function.

Han, X. (2013). A contrastive study of Chinese and British English request strategies based on open role-play. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 4(5), 1098-1105.

Halenko, N. (2016). *Evaluating the explicit pragmatic instruction of requests and apologies in a study abroad setting: the case of Chinese ESL learners at a UK Higher Education Institution*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Linguistics and English Language Lancaster University, the UK.

Hassall, T. J. (2001). Modifying requests in a second language. *International Review of Applied Linguistics,* 39, 259-283.

Hassall, T. J. (1997*). Requests by Australian learners of Indonesian*. Canberra: Australian National University.

House, J. (1996). Developing pragmatic fluency in English as a foreign language. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 18, 225-252.

Irshad, A. and Bukhari, N.H. (2020). Investigating the effect of explicit instruction on the development of pragmatic competence of Pakistani learners of English. *Kashmir Journal of Languager Research*, 23(1), 217-236.

Kogetsidis, M. E. (2008). Examining the pragmatic competence of Greek Cypriot learners of English in oral requests–A comparison with American native speakers. *Proceedings of the BAAL Annual Conference*, 2, 33-36.

Kondo, S. (2008). Effects on pragmatic development through awareness-raising instruction: Refusals by Japanese EFL learners. In E. Alcón and A. Martínez-Flor (Eds.). *Investigating pragmatics in foreign language learning, teaching and testing.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Li, S. (2013). The role of instruction in developing pragmatic competence in L2 Chinese: A review of empirical evidences. *Languages and Cultures Faculty Publications.* Retrieved August 31, 2020, From http://www.scholarworks.gsu. edu/mcl facpub/38

Liu, C.N. (2007). *Pragmatics in foreign language instruction: The effects of pedagogical intervention and technology on the development of EFL learners' realization of request.* Ph.D. Dissertation, Office of Graduate Studies of Texas A&M University, U.S.A.

Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In de Bot, R.Ginsberg & C. Kramsch (Eds.). *Foreign Language Research in Cross-Cultural Perspective.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Martinez-Flor , A. and Alcon, E. (2007). Developing pragmatic awareness of suggestions in the EFL classroom: A focus on instructional effects. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 10(1), 47-76.

Martinez-Flor, A. and Fukuya, Y. J. (2005). The effect of instruction on learners' production of appropriate and accurate suggestions. *System*, 33, 463-480.

Mirzaei, A. and Esmaeili, M. (2013). The effects of planned instruction on   Iranian L2 learners' interlanguage pragmatic development. *Iranian Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 1(1), 89-100.

Mohammed, M. 2012. *Teachability of pragmatic competence: The impact of explicit instruction on the development of Iraqi Freshman EFL learners' pragmatic competence*. Basrah University.

Nguyen, T. T. M., Pham T.H. and Pham, M. T. (2012). The relative effects of explicit and implicit form-focused instruction on the development of L2 pragmatic competence. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(4), 416-434.

Pearson, L. (2006). Patterns of development in Spanish L2 pragmatic acquisition: An analysis of novice learners' production of directives. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90, 473-495.

Rajabia, S., Azizifara, A. and Gowhary, H. (2015). The effect of explicit instruction on pragmatic competence development; teaching requests to EFL learners of English. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199, 231-239.

Rose, K.R. (2005). On the effects of instruction in second language pragmatics. *System*, 33, 385-399.

Rose, K. R. and Ng, C. K. (2001). Inductive and deductive teaching of compliments and compliment responses. In K.R Rose & G. Kasper (Eds*.). Pragmatics in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rosenshine, B. (1987). Explicit teaching and teacher training. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 38(3), 34-36.

Safont-Jorda, M. (2004). An analysis of EAP learners' pragmatic production: A focus on request forms. *Iberica,* 8, 23-39.

Schmidt, R. (1993). Consciousness, learning and interlanguage pragmatics. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. In R. Schmidt (Ed.). *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning.* (pp. 1-63). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.

Searle, J. (1976). A Classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5, 1-23.

Silva, A. (2003). The effect of instruction on pragmatic development: Teaching polite refusal in English. *Second Language Studies,* 22(1), 55-106.

Spada, N. and Lightbown, P.M. (2008). Form-focused instruction: Isolated or integrated. *TESOL Quarterly,* 42, 181-207.

Svanes, B. (1992). Development of realisation patterns of the speech act "asking someone to do something" by foreign students during three years in Norway. *Norsk Lingvistisk Tidsskift [Norwegian Linguistics Journal]*, 10, 3-38.

Taguchi, N. (2011a). Teaching pragmatics: Trends and issues. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics,* 31*,* 289-310.

Takahashi, S. (2010). The effect of pragmatic instruction on speech act performance. In A. Martínez-Flor & E. Use-Juan. (Eds.). Speech Act Performance: Theoretical, Empirical and Methodological Issues. (pp. 127-144.). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Takahashi, S. (2001). The role of input enhancement in developing pragmatic competence. In K.R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.). Pragmatics in Language Teaching. (pp.171-199). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Takahashi, S., and DuFon, M. (1989). Cross-linguistic influence in indirectness: The case of English directives performed by native Japanese speakers. Unpublished manuscript, Department of English as a Second Language, University of Hawaii at Manoa. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 370 439).

Takimoto, M. (2006a). The effects of explicit feedback and form-meaning processing on the development of pragmatic proficiency in consciousness-raising tasks. *System*, 34, 601-614.

Takimoto, M. (2006b). The effects of explicit feedback on the development of pragmatic proficiency. *Language Teaching Research*, 10, 393-417.

Takimoto, M. (2008). The effects of various kinds of form-focused instruction on learners' ability to comprehend and produce polite requests in English. *TESL Canada Journal*, 26(1), 31-51.

Takimoto, M. (2009). The effects of input-based tasks on the development of learners' pragmatic proficiency. *Applied Linguistics*, 30, 1-25.

Tateyama, Y. (2009). Requesting in Japanese: The effect of instruction on JFL Learners' pragmatic competence." In Taguchi, N. (Ed.). *Pragmatic Competence*. (pp.29-166). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Tateyama, Y., Kasper, G., Lara P. Mui, H.M.T. and Ong-on, T. (1997). Explicit and implicit teaching of pragmatic routines. In Bouton, L.(Ed.). *Pragmatics and Language Learning, Monograph.* (pp. 163-178). Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois,

Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage Pragmatics. Requests, Complaints and Apologies*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Van Compernolle, R. A. and Williams, L. (2012a). Promoting sociolinguistic competence in the classroom zone of proximal development. *Language Teaching Research,* 16, 39-60.

Van Compernolle, R.A. and Williams, L. (2012b). Teaching, learning, and developing L2 French sociolinguistic competence: A sociocultural perspective. *Applied Linguistics*, 33, 184-205.

Vellenga, H. (2008). *Instructional effectiveness and interlanguage pragmatics*. USA: Northern Arizona University.

Wei, R. (2012). Pragmatic development in Chinese speakers' L2 English refusals. In L. Roberts et al. (Eds.). *EUROSLA Yearbook, 12*. (pp. 44-58). [n.p.]: John Benjamins Publishing.

Wishnoff, J. R. (2000). Hedging your bets: L2 learners' acquisition of pragmatic devices in L2 academic writing and computer-mediated discourse. *Second Language Studies*, 19(1), 119–148.

Xiao-le, G. (2011). The effect of explicit and implicit instructions of request strategies. *Intercultural Communication Studies,* XX(1), 104-123.