Investigating the Effect of Explicit Instruction on the Development of Pragmatic Competence of Pakistani Learners of English

Asra Irshad[1]
Nadeem Haider Bukhari[2]

Abstract

The notion of pragmatic instruction is progressively gaining prominence in language pedagogy to enhance learner's development of pragmatic features. In the last decade, the focus of pragmatic research has gradually shifted to instructional methods and practices to develop pragmatic competence of the learners. As an effort in this direction, the present study examines the effect of explicit instruction of the speech act of suggestion in English on the development of pragmatic competence of Pakistani learners of English. The findings of the study indicate that explicit mode of instruction in Pragmatics especially related to speech acts is necessary for the development of pragmatic competence of Pakistani learners of English. This study commends the need of pragmatic instruction focusing equally on the rules of grammar and sociocultural aspects in ESL courses in language classrooms for enhancement of pragmatic abilities of the learners.

1. Introduction

The instruction of a language in the earlier times was devoted only to grammar correctness. A novel approach was presented in the 1970s that focused on the necessity of learning communicative functions of a language, and consequently an awareness was created in the language teachers to merge linguistic and extra linguistic elements of a language in their teaching. As the proficiency in linguistic abilities is not the lone surety of communicative competence (Eslami-Raskh, 2005; Meier, 1997), so it is a requirement for second and foreign language learners to acquire the ability to use language according to the context. The specialists of second language acquisition (SLA) have used a term pragmatic competence, for the effective use and adequate understanding of cultural standards of a target language (Bachman, 1990).

Pragmatic competence is a crucial aspect of successful communication in a second/target language as it helps a language user in appropriate use of language in different contexts

---

[1] PhD Scholar, Department of English, University of AJ&K, Muzaffarabad
[2] Professor, Department of English, University of AJ&K, Muzaffarabad

(Hilliard, 2017). The development of this ability is very important as includes the knowledge of a language beyond grammatical rules. The instruction of pragmatic elements of a language in a classroom aids the learners in the enhancement of pragmatic and communicative skills (Krisnawati, 2011). Though the results of teaching pragmatic elements to second language learners of English are positive (Da Silva, 2003), yet the provision of the learning opportunities for pragmatic competence development is still a challenge in the contexts of second or foreign language teaching (Kasper, 1997).

The pragmatic abilities of the learners of non-native languages can be improved by making them aware with the appropriate use and practice of speech acts (Wolfson, 1989; Olshtain & Cohen, 1990), as pragmatic competence contains the understanding of speech acts of a language (Nguyen, Pham, & Pham, 2012). Speech acts are the elementary components of linguistic communications (Searle, 1969), and some of them as greetings, thanking, and wishing good-byes have the rules that are taught in an explicit way (Wolfson, 1989). Suggestions are among the frequently used speech acts in our everyday routine. The speech act of suggestion is concerned with the speaker's belief of helping the hearer (Searle, 1969). The ability of making suitable suggestions expresses one's pragmatic competence. Consequently, the use of suggestions in English by the non-native learners of English show their proficiency level in English. Pragmatic instruction in suggestions can efficiently help in the development of learners' pragmatic competence (Aufa, 2011; Rezvani, Eslami-Rasekh, & Dastjerdi, 2014; Ghavamnia, Eslami-Rasekh, & Dastjerdi, 2018). Pragmatic abilities cannot be simply acquired without instruction (Waugh, 2014), as second language learning is a demanding task (Nawaz, Amin, & Tatla, 2015), but in Pakistan, the focus of instruction is mainly on grammar accuracy of the learners.

The students of English in Pakistan usually overlook the intended functions of language and cannot confidently speak English in both educational and social contexts (Mansoor, 2005; Rahman, 2004), however non-native contexts require the competency of the learners in both linguistic and pragmatic abilities. The reason behind this inability is the absence of pragmatic instruction in English language classrooms in Pakistan. The research studies pertaining to comparisons of the learners across proficiency levels on different aspects of pragmatic competence have been abundantly carried out (Taguchi, 2011), still, the investigations concerning the effect of instruction of suggestion speech act on pragmatic development are inadequate. Therefore, the present study investigates the effect of explicit instruction of speech act of suggestion in English on the development of pragmatic competence of Pakistani learners of English.

2. Literature Review

The intentional use of a language in social interactions is studied in Pragmatics. It includes the exploration of the language users' abilities to use or understand a language in a specific context (Salemi, Rabiee, & Ketabi, 2012). According to LoCastro (2003), Pragmatics is the branch of Linguistics that deals with the study of meaning created in the combined interaction of both speaker and hearer and includes linguistic aspects as well as non-linguistic gestures in the context of any socially or culturally organized activity (p. 15). Hence, Pragmatics includes all kinds of information associated with the attitude of the speaker towards the information, the intention of the speaker behind the utterance, and the conduct of the speaker with the listener (Banerjee & Carrell, 1988).

The linguists in last few decades have paid special attention to work on Interlanguage Pragmatics (ILP) which generally aims to study how non-native speakers perform a speech act in a target language (Kasper 1992), and so the researchers are gaining interest to examine the efficacy of pragmatic instruction on the learners in both second and foreign language learning classrooms (Soler, 2005). The benefits of pragmatic instruction in English language classes for raising pragmatic awareness of the learners cannot be disregarded (Bardovi-Harlig & Griffin, 2005). Explicit instruction in Pragmatics involves the knowledge which needs to be acquired until knowledge stability is reached, even if that stability is sometimes temporary (Ifantidou, 2013). The explicit way of pragmatic instruction provides knowledge and understanding by defining, demonstrating, and discussing specific target form of linguistic expression (Salemi, Rabiee, & Ketabi, 2012). The role of explicit mode of instruction on enhancement of pragmatic competence has been investigated in relation to speech acts, discourse organizations and social norms in spoken interaction (Ifantidou, 2013). The outcomes of explicit instruction in second language pragmatics are significantly encouraging especially in those academic contexts where the learners have no direct contact with the native speakers of target language (Eslami, Mirzaei, & Dini, 2015). A variety of research studies have emphasised on the effectiveness of explicit mode of instruction on pragmatic development of the learners (Da Silva, 2003; Soler, 2005; Nguyen, Pham, & Pham, 2012; Ifantidou, 2013; Alcon-Soler, 2015; Taguchi, Naganuma, & Budding, 2015).

Successful performance of speech acts is a significant aspect of pragmatic competence and it demands the speaker's linguistic proficiency and perception of socio-pragmatic rules of speech acts in a language (Ahmadi, Kargar, & Rostampour, 2014). Suggestions are communicative acts in which a speaker offers a possible plan or idea to the other person about how to act in a situation. As suggestions are often viewed as an obligation on the addressee by causing offense to his negative face image (Banerjee & Carrell, 1988), so,

Martínez-Flor (2005) maintained that the addresser usually tries to make this speech act softer by using specific suggestion strategies with the purpose of possibly reducing the chances of offence to the addressee. Suggestions are considered as constituent of a broader speech act of advice (Martínez-Flor, 2005; Heidari, 2013), however the studies have used the terms suggestions and advice acts interchangeably for the same speech act (Searle, 1969; Banerjee & Carrell, 1988; Tsui, 1994; Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1996; Mandala, 1999).

The first research on suggestions in context of English as second language learning was conducted by Banerjee and Carrell (1988) to investigate the variations in suggestions between adult native and non-native language users. After this study, many researchers gained awareness to focus on the phenomenon of suggestion and so in the same vein, pragmatic literature related to the use of speech act of suggestion, contains some studies (Suzuki, 2009; Pishghadam & Sharafadini, 2011; Mahmoudi-Gahrouei, 2013; Ekin, 2013; Heidari, 2013; Farnia, Sohrabie, & Sattar, 2014; Ahmadi, Kargar, & Rostampour, 2014; Gu, 2014) which have examined the use of pragmatic strategies for pragmatic competence development.

Similarly, the research studies have provided evidence on how the instruction of suggestions can impact on the development of pragmatic abilities of the learners of second and foreign languages. Koike and Pearson (2005) conducted a research to observe the efficacy of instruction of pragmatic information using explicit or implicit methods on English-speaking learners of Spanish and observed encouraging results of such teaching methods on the enhancement of pragmatic competence. Martínez-Flor and Fukuya (2005) studied the execution of explicit and implicit modes of pragmatic instruction for teaching speech act of suggestion and found that the approach of joined instruction of the two methods as a comprehensive decision for teaching suggestions to the learners of foreign languages. In the same way, Martínez-Flor and Soler (2007) investigated the explicit and implicit instructional effects on the development of pragmatic consciousness of suggestions in the EFL classroom and observed the benefits of instruction on the advancement of pragmatic competence of the learners. Moreover, Aufa (2011) conducted a study to explore the use of DCT as a tool for pragmatic teaching through explicit ways and applied it on Indonesian learners to examine the effect of the use of DCT on their production of suggestion acts. It was aimed to facilitate the learners in developing their pragmatic competence and the study observed many benefits of using DCT for the enhancement of pragmatic competence of EFL learners.

However, Aminifard, Safaei, and Askari (2014) studied the ways of employment of suggestions across different language proficiency levels and revealed no significant differences in use of speech act of suggestion due to the difference of language proficiency

levels of the participants. Likewise, Rezvani, Eslami-Rasekh, and Dastjerdi (2014) examined the impact of instruction of the speech act of suggestion through explicit and implicit methods on the development of pragmatic abilities of Iranian learners of English. It was found that both types of instruction caused a significant impact on the pragmatic development of the EFL learners. Similarly, Chalak and Abbasi (2015) explored the effects of pragmatic instruction of suggestion strategies using explicit and implicit methods on Iranian learners of English and observed positive impacts of such pragmatic instruction on their pragmatic development. Recently, Ghavamnia, Eslami-Rasekh, and Dastjerdi (2018) investigated the efficiency of four different sorts of instructional techniques on the enhancement of pragmatically and grammatically appropriate suggestions for the pragmatic development of Iranian learners of English. The study revealed that explicit instruction as well as enhanced input techniques outperformed the others in enhancing the development of pragmatic competence of the EFL learners.

Regardless of the great variety of cross-cultural empirical studies on different types of speech acts, the researchers have observed the scarcity of pragmatic literature on suggestions, (Martínez-Flor, 2005; Jiang, 2006; Guerra & Martinez-Flor, 2006; Heidari, 2013; Gu, 2014). Moreover, no research study has been carried out up till now on the effect of instruction of speech act of suggestion in Pakistan. Therefore, the current study explores the effect of explicit instruction of speech act of suggestion in English on the development of pragmatic competence of Pakistani students of English.

3. Research Question
The present study addresses the following research question:
- What is the effect of explicit instruction of the speech act of suggestion on the development of pragmatic competence of Pakistani learners of English?

4. Research Methodology
The study applied a mixed-method research design. The data was collected qualitatively using open-ended responses of Discourse Completion Test (DCT) and analyzed quantitatively to see the effect of explicit instruction on the learners by employing quasi-experimental way using a pretest-posttest design, via SPSS software version 23.

4.1 Participants
A sample of two-hundred (200) university students at five (5) different universities in Pakistan specifically, (a) Hazara University, Dodhial, Mansehra; (b) Air University, Islamabad; (c) Riphah International University, Islamabad; (d) Abbottabad University of

Science & Technology (AUST), Abbottabad; and (e) University of Azad Jammu and Kashmir, Muzaffarabad, was selected using convenience sampling procedures, for the current research study. The participants were enrolled in bachelor's and masters' degree program in English language/literature at the five universities of Pakistan.

4.2 Procedures

At the beginning of the study, a language proficiency test (Oxford Placement Test) which included every aspect of language proficiency (Salemi, Rabiee, & Ketabi, 2012), was administered for the confirmation of the homogeneity of the participants at the proficiency levels as determined by their institutes. The classes of the students were then separately assigned to control and experimental groups. At the start of the study, a pre-test in the form of Discourse Completion Test (DCT) (see Appendix) was conducted separately to both the control and experimental groups to evaluate the prior knowledge of the participants about the use of suggestions in English for supplementary comparison with the post-test. The study considered two levels of status as, equal status (student to student interaction) and higher status (student to teacher interaction) for the eight (8) suggestion-eliciting situations in the DCT.

The learners in experimental groups were provided with explicit instruction for almost two months i.e., approx. twenty (20) hours during their regular study sessions at their universities. The instructional treatment started with delivering introductory lectures on topics of Pragmatics and Speech Acts concentrating on directive Speech Acts from Yule (1996) and LoCastro (2003). Later, the students were engaged in useful activities, role plays and conversation practices in proper classroom environment. The activities were designed to focus on the five (5) explicit instructional stages, namely, (a) presentation of learning targets, (b) explaining learning targets, (c) planning sessions, (d) communication sessions, and (e) feedback, as proposed by Farahian, Rezaee, and Gholami (2012). Though the teaching sessions of the students were separately arranged in each of the five mentioned universities, yet each treatment group received the same type of instruction. The study generally adopted the instructional approach proposed by Salemi, Rabiee and Ketabi, (2012), comprising three steps, specifically, introductory, practicing and interactive phases, for each of the class session. However, the learners in the control group did not take any kind of instruction.

After instructional treatment, a post-test in the form of DCT was applied to all the participants of experimental and control groups with the purpose of assessing the effect of

pragmatic instruction. This DCT was same as the pre-test except that there was a shuffling of the items which caused difference of the serial numbers of situations with the purpose to avoid memorization of the responses from the pre-test by the learners.

4.3 Instructional Targets of the Study

Along with the focus on Martinez-Flor's (2005) categorization of suggestion strategies, other pedagogical targets were chosen following different studies on the effect of explicit instruction on use of suggestions (Martinez-Flor & Fukuya, 2005; Ghavamnia, Eslami-Rasekh, & Vahid Dastjerdi, 2018). The instructional foci included twelve (12) head acts (HAs) for making suggestions and seven (7) downgraders for softening the effect of this speech act. Each type of the target form was explicitly taught, in view of Ghavamnia, Eslami-Rasekh, and Dastjerdi (2018) that divided the twelve (12) HAs into two groups according to status. As shown in Table 4.1, the downgraders, such as, just, perhaps, I think, probably, personally, maybe, and, I'm not sure but I think, were considered for the present study.

Table 4.1 *Combinations of Suggestions focusing on the differences of Social Status*

Equal Status	Higher Status
Why don't you . . .?	I would probably suggest that . . .
Have you tried . . .?	Personally, I would recommend that . . .
You can just . . .	May be you could . . .
You might want to . . .	It would be helpful if you . . .
Perhaps you should . . .	I think it might be better to . . .
I think you need . . .	I'm not sure, but I think a good idea would be . . .

(Source: Ghavamnia, Eslami-Rasekh, & Dastjerdi, 2018)

4.4 Data Analysis

The received data that constituted a total of 6,400 responses (200 participants x 2 tests x 16 (8x2) situations) of the participants was first analyzed on an individual basis. The data was coded and compiled in separate Microsoft Office Excel files and document sheets. Two tutors of English were employed to rate the responses of the DCT according to the provided grading system of Martinez-Flor (2004) for Head Acts (HAs) and Downgraders, that ranged from 0 score to 1.5 scores for both the levels of pragmatic and grammatical appropriateness. Moreover, the scores were awarded for pragmatic or grammatical accuracy only when the participants employed the HAs as the twelve target forms (see Table 1) in appropriate

contexts with consideration of equal status or higher status. Table 4.2 displays the examples of the assignment of scores for appropriateness.

Table 4.2 *Assignment of Scores*

Examples	Score	Explanation for Score
You can buy this cup is	0	on condition that Combination 2 is used as HA a target form in Combination 1
You should buy this cup	1	on condition that Combination 1 is used as HA is one of the selected target forms in this combination
Perhaps, you should buy this cup	1.5	because both HA and the downgrader are the selected target forms
It was helpful if you go to this store	0	since the pragmalinguistic form is Incorrect
It would be helpful if you are going to this store	1	since the pragmalinguistic part is correct, but connecting part is incorrect
It would be helpful if you go to this store	1.5	since both the pragmalinguistic form and connecting part are correct

(Source: Martinez-Flor, 2004)

Succeeding the manual data analysis, the statistical analysis of the data sets was carried out. Quantitative analysis of the DCT data of pre- and post-test scores of experimental and control groups was conducted by means of Independent Samples t-test, by entering the data into the SPSS software version 23. For this purpose, the scores of pre-tests responses of both experimental and control groups were compared to the scores of post-tests responses of both experimental and control group participants for assessment of their pragmatic appropriateness and grammatical appropriateness.

5. Results and Discussion
The research question of the current study referred to the effect of explicit instruction of suggestion speech act on the development of pragmatic competence of Pakistani university students of English. In order to answer the question, the data was analyzed in consideration of the instructed target forms during the treatment sessions of the study (see Table 4.1). The

scores of all participants (200), including both experimental (100) and control (100) groups were considered in order to compare learner's suggestions in pre- and post-tests to assess the instructional effects. The pragmatic appropriateness and grammatical appropriateness of each response was assessed separately, first for equal status and then for higher status for each situation in the DCT. An Independent Samples t-test was conducted using SPSS version. 23 to ensure the significant differences regarding appropriateness for comparing the overall use of pragmatically and grammatically appropriate suggestions of experimental and control groups in the pre- and post-tests of each situation by probing into the variable of social status. Table 5.1 demonstrates the results of Independent Samples t-Test for comparison of pragmatic and grammatical appropriateness of experimental and control groups in equal status situations.

Table 5.1 *Comparison of Pragmatic and Grammatical Appropriateness of Experimental and Control Groups in Equal Status Situations*

		N	M.dif	SD.dif	t	Df	P
Experimental Group	Pragmatic Appropriateness	100	-1.046	0.078	-15.986	198	0.000
	Grammatical Appropriateness	100	-0.014	0.479	-9.870	198	0.000
Control Group	Pragmatic Appropriateness	100	-0.013	0.035	-0.235	198	0.395
	Grammatical Appropriateness	100	-0.015	0.568	-0.301	198	0.589

Table 5.1 illustrates statistically significant differences between the scores of pre- and post-tests for pragmatically appropriate (t = -15.986, df = 198, and p = 0.000) and grammatically appropriate (t = -9.870, df = 198, and p = 0.000) suggestions of the participants in experimental group for equal status situations. As the analysis involved the comparisons of the scores of pre- and post-tests, so in order to get ease in understanding, the values of mean difference and standard deviation difference for pragmatic appropriateness (M=-1.046, SD=0.078) and grammatical appropriateness (M=-0.014, SD=0.511) of the participants were considered. As presented in Table 5.1, there are significant differences in the experimental group in the results of pragmatic and grammatical appropriateness of the participants as observed by the two p values (0.000) which are less than 0.05 on 95 % confidence interval and hence confirm the effect of explicit instruction on the treatment group participants.

Table 5.1 displays no statistically significant difference between the scores of pre- and post-tests for pragmatically appropriate (t = -0.235, df = 198, and p = 0.395) and grammatically appropriate (t = -0.301, df = 198, and p = 0.589) suggestions of the participants in control group for equal status situations. As the analysis involved the comparisons of the scores of pre- and post-tests, so for making ease in understanding, the values of mean difference and standard deviation difference for pragmatic appropriateness (M=-0.013, SD=0.035) and grammatical appropriateness (M=-0.015, SD=0.568) of the participants were considered. By means of the results, the absence of significant differences (p<0.05) in the pragmatic and grammatical appropriateness of the participants in control group confirms that improvement in pragmatic skills cannot be made without explicit instruction.

Table 5.2 exhibits the results of Independent Samples t-Test for comparison of pragmatic and grammatical appropriateness of experimental and control groups in higher status situations.

Table 5.2 *Comparison of Pragmatic and Grammatical Appropriateness of Experimental and Control Groups in Higher Status Situations*

		N	M.dif	SD.dif	t	Df	P
Experimental	Pragmatic Appropriateness	100	-1.784	0.786	-8.868	198	0.000
	Grammatical Appropriateness	100	-0.098	0.564	-11.987	198	0.000
Control Group	Pragmatic Appropriateness	100	-1.365	0.098	-0.267	198	0.485
	Grammatical Appropriateness	100	-0.089	1.134	-0.654	198	0.312

Table 5.2 presents statistically significant differences between the scores of pre- and post-tests for pragmatically appropriate (t = -8.868, df = 198, and p = 0.000) and grammatically appropriate (t = -11.987, df = 198, and p = 0.000) suggestions of the participants in experimental group for higher status situations. As the analysis involved the comparisons of the scores of pre- and post-tests, so in order to have ease in understanding, the values of mean difference and standard deviation difference for pragmatic appropriateness (M=-1.784, SD=0.786) and grammatical appropriateness (M=-0.098, SD=0.564) of the participants were considered. As presented in Table 5.2, there are meaningful differences in the results of pragmatic and grammatical appropriateness of the participants as observed by p values (0.000) which are less than 0.05 on 95 % confidence interval and hence confirm the effect of

explicit instruction on the treatment group participants.

Table 5.2 displays no statistically significant difference between the scores of pre- and post-tests for pragmatically appropriate (t = -0.267, df = 198, and p = 0.485) and grammatically appropriate (t = -0.654, df = 198, and p = 0.312) suggestions of the participants in control group for higher status situations. As the analysis involved the comparisons of the scores of pre- and post-tests, so for better understanding, the values of mean difference and standard deviation difference for pragmatic appropriateness (M=-1.365, SD=0.098) and grammatical appropriateness (M=-0.089, SD=1.134) of the participants were considered. The indication of the absence of significant difference (p<0.05) in the results of the pragmatic and grammatical appropriateness of the participants in control group confirms that improvement in pragmatic skills cannot be achieved without explicit instruction.

The findings of the study have demonstrated that experimental group in both equal and higher status situations significantly enhanced the use of suggestions from pre-test to post-test, while such results have not been noticed for control group. Moreover, as reported in the results, experimental group in both equal and higher status situations has shown an increase in the scores of post-test in comparison to pre-test scores with statistically significant differences (p<.05) for both pragmatic and grammatical appropriateness, which depict an evident improvement in pragmatic learning after getting explicit treatment. However, the results of control group have revealed almost same scores for pre- and post-tests without showing statistically significant differences (p<.05), which depict no improvement in pragmatic learning due to the lack of instructional treatment.

Furthermore, it can be concluded that explicit instruction in language learning supports the learners in developing their pragmatic abilities along with the awareness about the correct use of linguistic forms in different contexts. This finding of the positive effect of explicit instruction on pragmatic development is consistent with the findings of many studies (Schmidt, 1993; Da Silva, 2003; Rose, 2005; Soler, 2005; Martínez-Flor & Fukuya, 2005; Jeon & Kaya, 2006; Aufa, 2011; Nguyen, Pham, & Pham, 2012; Salemi, Rabiee, & Ketabi, 2012; Eslami, Mirzaei, & Dini, 2015; Taguchi, Naganuma, & Budding, 2015) that presented positive effects of explicit instructional approach for enhancement of pragmatic ability of the learners. Hence, the findings have observed encouraging effects of explicit instruction of the speech act of suggestion on the development of pragmatic competence of the learners of English in Pakistan.

6. Conclusion

This research study explored the effect of explicit instruction of the speech act of suggestion in English on the development of pragmatic competence of Pakistani university students of English. The data was collected using written DCT and the responses of the participants were rated adopting the scoring system of Martinez-Flor (2004) for Head Acts (HAs) and downgraders, based on thri-grading system ranging from 0 score to 1.5 scores for both appropriateness level and grammatical level. The obtained scores were computed using SPSS version 23. The improvement in the scores of the participants in the post-test findings have revealed beneficial effects of explicit way of instruction for teaching the use of socially and culturally appropriate forms and discourse aspects of English language to Pakistani learners for making them communicatively fluent in English. Consequently, explicit mode of instruction is necessary to enhance pragmatic competence of Pakistani students of English, which may be attained by the practice of performing speech acts in proper fashion. Thus, the present study recommends the necessity of extensive pragmatic instruction in English language classrooms.

6.1 Research Implications

The study offers an important pedagogical implication that emphasizes the need of teaching both linguistic and pragmatic rules of English language in classrooms for development of pragmatic competence of the learners. The results of the study emphasize the importance of conscious focus on functional and contextual features of language, that can be fulfilled by providing instruction of speech acts specially suggestion strategies in proper syllabus for the development of pragmatic competence of the students of English. The findings of the study highlight advantages of explicit instruction through pragmatic exercises that implies the challenge of developing pragmatic awareness through such instructional approaches. The study also suggests training courses for English teachers to make them well equipped with pragmatic rules so that they could be able to integrate Pragmatics into their current teaching syllabuses. Since suggestions are practiced commonly in daily routine and a failure in their proper performance may represent the speaker as impolite, so the teaching and learning of different suggestion strategies for the learners of English need to be encouraged in Pakistan.

References

Ahmadi, M., Kargar, A. A., & Rostampour, M. (2014). Investigating the role of gender, proficiency level and l1 on Iranian EFL learners' production of suggestion' speech

act. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, *6*(3), 163-180.

Alcon-Soler, E. (2015). Pragmatic learning and study abroad: Effects of instruction and length of stay. *System*, *48*, 62-74.

Aminifard, Y., Safaei, E., & Askari, H. (2014). Speech Act of Suggestion Across Language Proficiency and Gender in Iranian Context. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *3*(5), 198-205.

Aufa, F. (2011). The use of discourse completion task (DCT) as explicit instruction on Indonesian EFL learners' production of suggestion acts. JEE, *Journal of English and Education, 5*(2), 21-43.

Banerjee, J., & Carrell, P. L. (1988). Tuck in your shirt, you squid: Suggestions in ESL. *Language learning*, *38*(3), 313-364.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Griffin, R. (2005). L2 pragmatic awareness: Evidence from the ESL classroom. *System*, *33*(3), 401-415.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. S. (1996). Input in an institutional setting. *Studies in second language acquisition*, *18*(2), 171-188.

Chalak, A., & Abbasi, S. (2015). The Effects of Explicit and Implicit Pragmatic Instruction on Iranian EFL Learners' Production of Suggestion Speech Act in the Context of Distance Learning. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, *2*(4), 275-284.

Da Silva, A. J. B. (2003). The effects of instruction on pragmatic development: Teaching polite refusals in English. *Second Language Studies*, *22*(1), 55-106.

Ekin, M. T. Y. (2013). Do current EFL coursebooks work for the development of L2 pragmatic competence? The case of suggestions. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *93*, 1306-1310.

Eslami-Rasekh, Z. (2005). Raising the pragmatic awareness of language learners. *ELT journal*, *59*(3), 199-208.

Eslami, Z. R., Mirzaei, A., & Dini, S. (2015). The role of asynchronous computer mediated communication in the instruction and development of EFL learners' pragmatic competence. *System*, *48*, 99-111.

Farahian, M., Rezaee, M., & Gholami, A. (2012). Does direct instruction develop pragmatic competence? Teaching refusals to EFL learners of English. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *3*(4), 814-821.

Farnia, M., Sohrabie, A., & Sattar, H. Q. A. (2014). A Pragmatic Analysis of Speech Act of Suggestion among Iranian Native Speakers of Farsi. *Journal of ELT and Applied*

Linguistics (JELTAL), *2*(2), 48-61.

Flor, A. M., & Guerra, A. B. F. (2006). Is teaching how to" suggest" a good" suggestion"?: an empirical study based on EFL learners' accuracy and appropriateness when making suggestions. *Porta Linguarum: revista internacional de didáctica de las lenguas extranjeras*, (5), 91-108.

Gahrouei, V. M. (2013). A Sociopragmatic Study of Speech Act of Suggestion in Persian EFL. *The Iranian EFL Journal*, *49*(1), 241-249.

Ghavamnia, M., Eslami-Rasekh, A., & Vahid Dastjerdi, H. (2018). The effects of input-enhanced instruction on Iranian EFL learners' production of appropriate and accurate suggestions. *The Language Learning Journal*, *46*(2), 114-131.

Gu, T. (2014). A corpus-based study on the performance of the suggestion speech act by Chinese EFL learners. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *4*(1), 103.

Heidari, M. A. (2013). A sociolinguistic and cross-cultural investigation into the speech act of suggestion. *International Journal of Culture and History*, *1*(1), 1-18.

Hilliard, A. (2017). Twelve Activities for Teaching the Pragmatics of Complaining to L2 Learners. *English Teaching Forum*, *55*(1), 2-13.

Ifantidou, E. (2013). Pragmatic competence and explicit instruction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *59*, 93-116.

Jeon, E. H., & Kaya, T. (2006). Effects of L2 instruction on interlanguage pragmatic development. *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching*, 165-211.

Jiang, X. (2006). Suggestions: What should ESL students know?. *System*, *34*(1), 36-54.

Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. Interlanguage studies bulletin (Utrecht), 8(3), 203-231.

Kasper, G. (1997). The role of pragmatics in language teacher education. *Beyond methods: Components of language teacher education*, 113-136.

Koike, D. A., & Pearson, L. (2005). The effect of instruction and feedback in the development of pragmatic competence. *System*, *33*(3), 481-501.

Krisnawati, E. (2011). Pragmatic competence in the spoken English classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *1*(1), 105-115.

LoCastro, V. (2003). *An introduction to pragmatics: Social action for language teachers*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Martínez Flor, A. (2004). The effect of instruction on the development of pragmatic competence in the English as a foreign language context: A study based on suggestions. *Doctoral Dissertation*.

Martinez-Flor, A. (2005). A theoretical review of the speech act of suggesting: Towards taxonomy for Its use in FLT. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 18, 167-187.

Martínez-Flor, A., & Fukuya, Y. J. (2005). The effects of instruction on learners' production of appropriate and accurate suggestions. *System*, *33*(3), 463-480.

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

Mandala, S. (1999). Exiting advice. *Pragmatics and language learning*, *9*, 89-112.

Mansoor, S. (2005). *Language planning in higher education: A case study of Pakistan*. Oxford University Press, USA.

Meier, A. J. (1997). Teaching the universals of politeness. *ELT journal*, *51*(1), 21-28.

Nawaz, H., Amin, M., & Tatla, I. A. (2015). Factors Affecting Students' Motivation Level to Learn English as a Second Language in the Pakistani University Context. *Journal of Research & Reflections in Education (JRRE)*, *9*(2), 103-115.

Nguyen, T. T. M., Pham, T. H., & 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.

Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. (1990). The learning of complex speech act behaviour. *TESL Canada Journal*, *7*(2), 45-65.

Pishghadam, R., & Sharafadini, M. (2011). Delving into speech act of suggestion: A case of Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, *2*(16), 152-160.

Rahman, T. (2004). Language policy and localization in Pakistan: proposal for a paradigmatic shift. In *SCALLA Conference on computational linguistics*, *99*,1-19.

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 request and suggestion in focus. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, *3*(7), 1-12.

Rose, K. R. (2005). On the effects of instruction in second language pragmatics. *System*, *33*(3), 385-399.

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.

Schmidt, R. (1993). Consciousness, learning and interlanguage pragmatics. *Interlanguage pragmatics*, *21*(42), 1-31.

Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech acts: *An essay in the philosophy of language*, *626*, Cambridge university press.

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

Suzuki, T. (2009). A Study of Lexicogrammatical and Discourse Strategies for 'Suggestion' with the Use of the English Speech Act Corpus. 131-159.

Taguchi, N. (2011). The effect of L2 proficiency and study-abroad experience on pragmatic comprehension. *Language Learning*, *61*(3), 904-939.

Taguchi, N., Naganuma, N., & Budding, C. (2015). Does Instruction Alter the Naturalistic Pattern of Pragmatic Development? A Case of Request Speech Act. The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language, *19*(3), 1-25.

Tsui, A. B. (1994). *English conversation*. Oxford University Press.

Waugh, E. (2014). Teaching pragmatics and intercultural communication online. *TESLCanada Journal*, *30*(7), 98-107.

Wolfson, N. (1989). *Perspectives: sociolinguistics and TESOL.* Cambridge: Newbury House Publishers.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics.* Oxford University Press.

Appendix
Discourse Completion Test

Personal Information:
Name: _____
Nationality: _____
Gender: male ____   female _____
Level of Education: Bachelor _____   Masters _____
Age: 18-20_____,   20-25_____,   26 and over_____
For how many years have you studied English? _____
University: _____
Telephone No (if any): _____

Directions: Dear participant, following is the questionnaire about suggestions strategies in English. You are given eight (8) parallel situations in which you have to make suggestions. Please imagine yourself in the given situations and respond as naturally as possible. If for some reason you think you would not say anything in a situation, you may leave the space for that situation. Please fill in the questionnaire carefully and thank you for your cooperation.

Suggestion Situations:
1. You are in a bookstore with your classmate. He/she is going to buy an expensive book about English grammar. However, you have seen the same book in another bookstore at a lower price. What would you suggest to him/her?
Classmate: I'm looking for a good book of English grammar, I liked this one but it is expensive.
You: _____

You are in a bookstore with your teacher. He/she is going to buy an expensive book about English grammar. However, you have seen the same book in another bookstore at a lower price. What would you suggest to him/her?
Teacher: I'm looking for a good book of English grammar, I liked this one but it is expensive.
You:_____

2. You are at a medical store with a classmate. He/she is about to buy a medicine for stomachache which is tagged with a reasonable price. You notice that the expiry date written

on the packet is February 2018 and this is February 2019. What would you suggest to him/her?
Classmate: I need this medicine for my stomachache.
You: _____

You are at a medical store with a newly appointed professor of your university. He/she is about to buy a medicine for stomachache which is tagged with a reasonable price. You notice that the expiry date written on the packet is February 2018 and this is February 2019. What would you suggest to him/her?
Professor: I need this medicine for my stomachache.
You: _____

3. You are working on a computer at computer lab of your university campus. One of your classmates sits next to you. He/she is trying to use the printer but fails to get it to operate because he/she does not know that the printer requires clicking certain button before printing can proceed. What would you suggest to him/her?
Classmate: I'm trying to take a print of an important document, but the printer is not working.
You: _____

You are working on a computer at computer lab of your university campus. One of your Professors sits next to you. He/she is trying to use the printer but fails to get it to operate because he/she does not know that the printer requires clicking certain button before printing can proceed. What would you suggest to him/her?
Professor: I'm trying to take a print of an important document, but the printer is not working.
You: _____

4. You are looking for a book in your university library. You meet a new classmate who is searching the internet in order to prepare a class assignment and looks very tired. You remember the website links that your teacher told you a day before, for accessing the relevant referring material. What would you suggest to him/her?
Classmate: I am so tired since, I've been working all day.
You:_____

You are looking for a book in your university library. You meet an old Professor who is searching the internet in order to prepare a lecture for his/her class and looks very tired. You

remember the website links that your teacher told you a day before, for accessing the relevant referring material. What would you suggest to him/her?

Professor: I am so tired since, I've been working all day.

You: _____

5. You are in a class and your classmate discusses the difficulties in collecting information related to customs of people of a municipality for a class project. You know some well-known people of that town and you think that talking via mobile phone to those people can be an easy way of collecting the required information. What would you suggest to him/her?

Classmate: I am working on an important project but I could not ascertain an appropriate way to contact people from this town.

You: _____

You are in a class and your teacher discusses the difficulties in collecting information related to customs of people of a municipality for a research project. You know some well-known people of that town and you think that talking via mobile phone to those people can be an easy way of collecting the required information. What would you suggest to him/her?

Teacher: I am working on an important project but I could not ascertain an appropriate way to contact people from this town.

You: _____

6. You are attending your classmate's presentation on academic writing in university auditorium. You notice that your classmate is unaware of the mistake while initializing PowerPoint slides, he/she has clicked on a private/personal file that has been displayed on the projector. What would you suggest to him/her?

Classmate: Thank you for the attention, your questions and suggestion will be welcomed.

You: _____

You are attending your teacher's presentation on academic writing in university auditorium. You notice that your teacher is unaware of the mistake that while initializing the PowerPoint slides, he/she has clicked on a private/personal file that has been displayed on the projector. What would you suggest to him/her?

Teacher: Thank you for the attention, your questions and suggestion will be welcomed.

You: _____

7. You are sitting near the entrance door of your classroom, waiting for a class to begin. One of your classmates walks into the classroom and stands right in front of you. You notice that the price tag of his/her new jacket has not been removed and it can be easily seen. What would you suggest to him/her?

Classmate: Hi, Good morning!

You: _____

You are sitting near the entrance door of your classroom, waiting for a class to begin. Your teacher walks into the classroom and stands right in front of you. You notice that the price tag of his/her new jacket has not been removed and it can be easily seen. What would you suggest to him/her?

Professor: Hi, Good morning!

You: _____

8. You are walking downstairs in the campus hall. You encounter a classmate. He/she is going to the reading room in the library. You are aware that the reading room is undergoing repairs and is therefore noisy. What would you suggest to him/her?

Classmate: Hi, I am going to read a book in noise-free environment of the library

You: _____

You are walking downstairs in the campus hall. You encounter an old professor. He/she is going to the reading room in the library. You are aware that the reading room is undergoing repairs and is therefore noisy. What would you suggest to him/her?

Professor: Hi, I am going to read a book in noise-free environment of the library

You: _____