

العنوان:	A Suggested Pragmatics Based Program for Developing EFL Majors Pragmatic Competence
المصدر:	المجلة العلمية لكلية التربية
الناشر:	جامعة الوادي الجديد - كلية التربية
المؤلف الرئيسي:	Sayed, Osama Hassanein
المجلد/العدد:	مج1, ع1
محكمة:	نعم
التاريخ الميلادي:	2008
الشهر:	يوليو
الصفحات:	1 - 65
رقم MD:	1161680
نوع المحتوى:	بحوث ومقالات
اللغة:	English
قواعد المعلومات:	EduSearch
مواضيع:	البرامج التعليمية، طرق التدريس، تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية، اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية
رابط:	http://search.mandumah.com/Record/1161680

Yunxia, Z & Peter Thompson (2000): "Invitation or Sexual Harassment? An Analysis of an Intercultural Communication Breakdown." M/C: A Journal of Media and Culture, Vol. 3, No. 4 [Available online at 15 January 2008]
www.apinetwork.com/mc/0008/invitation.php>

- Silva, A. (2003): "The Effect of Instruction on Pragmatic Development: Teaching polite Refusals in English". Second Language Studies, Vol. 22, No. 1, Pp. 55-106.
- Searle, J. & D. Vanderveken (1985): Foundations of illocutionary logic. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University.
- Takahashi, S. (2001): "The role of input enhancement in developing pragmatic competence". In Rose, K. & G. Kasper (Eds.), Pragmatics in language teaching (Pp. 125-144). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tateyama, Y. (2001): "Explicit and implicit teaching of pragmatic routines". In Rose, K. & G. Kasper (Eds.), Pragmatics in language teaching, (Pp. 200-222). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vellenga, H. (2004): "Learning Pragmatics from ESL & EFL Textbooks: How Likely?" Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language (TESL-EJ), Vol. 8, No. 2, Pp. 1-18.
- Yule, G. (1996): The Study Of Language, 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Olshtain, E. & A. Cohen (1990): "The learning of complex speech act behavior". TESL Canada Journal, Vol. 7, Pp. 45-65.
- Paula, G. (2004): "Pragmatic Comprehension of High and Low Level Language Learners." Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language (TESL-EJ), Vol. 8, No. 2, Pp. 1-15.
- Pearson, L. (2001): "Pragmatics and foreign language teaching: The effect of metapragmatic discussion on the acquisition of expressions of gratitude, apologies, and directives by L2 Spanish learners". Unpublished PhD dissertation, The University of Texas, Austin.
- Rose, K. & C. Ng Kwain-fun (2001): "Inductive and deductive teaching of compliments and compliment responses". In Rose, K. & G. Kasper (Eds.), Pragmatics in language teaching (Pp. 145-170). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Raffaella Z. & P. Portner (2003): "Exclamative Clauses: At the Syntax-Semantics Interface." Language, Vol. 79, No. 1, Pp. 39-81.

Mwinyelle, J. (2005): "The Acquisition of Pragmatic Competence in an L2 Classroom: Giving Advice in Spanish". Unpublished PhD dissertation, Faculty of the Graduate School, The University of Texas at Austin.

Morrow, K. (1996): "The pragmatic effects of instruction on ESL learners' production of complaint and refusal speech acts". Unpublished PhD dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.

Nelson, G. L, Al-Batal, M. & El-Bakary, W. (2002): "Directness vs. indirectness: Egyptian Arabic and US English communication style". International Journal of Intercultural Relations, Vol. 26, Pp. 39-57.

Nakajima, Y. (1997): "Politeness Strategies in the workplace: Which Experiences help Japanese Businessmen Acquire American English Native-Like Strategies". WPEL, Vol. 13, No. 1, Pp. 49-69.

Overfield, D. (1996): "Teaching pragmatic competence: Input, interaction and consciousness-raising". Unpublished PhD dissertation, The University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh.

- Kubota, M. (1995): "Teachability of Conversational Implicature to Japanese EFL Learners". The IRLT Bulletin, Vol. 9, Pp. 35-67.
- Kondo, S. (2001): "Instructional effects on pragmatic development: Interlanguage refusal". Paper presented at Pacific Second Language Research Forum at University of Hawai'i at Manoa.
- Linnell, J. et al. (1992): "Can you Apologize me? An Investigation of Speech Act performance among Non-Native Speakers of English". WPEL, Vol. 8, No. 2, Pp. 33-53.
- LoCastro, V. (2000): "Evidence of accommodation to L2 pragmatic norms in peer review tasks of Japanese learners of English". JALT Journal, Vol. 23, No. 1, Pp. 6-30.
- LoCastro, V. (1997): "Pedagogical intervention and pragmatic competence development". Applied Language Learning, Vol. 8, Pp. 75-109.
- Martinez, F. et al (2006): "Pragmatic Competence and Foreign Language Teaching". Journal of Pragmatics, Vol. 38, Pp. 600-604.

- Ishihara, N. (2004): "Exploring the Immediate and Delayed Effects of Formal Instruction: Teaching Giving and Responding to Compliments"
MinneTESOL/WITESOL Journal, Vol. 21, Pp. 1-34.
- Koike, D. & L. Pearson (2005): "The Effect of Instruction and Feedback in the Development of Pragmatic competence". SYETEM, Vol. 33, Pp. 481-501.
- Kasper, G. (1997): "Can pragmatic competence be taught?" (NetWork #6) [HTML document]. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center. Retrieved December, 7, 2007, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW06/>
- King, K. & R. Silver (1993): "Sticking points: Effects of instruction on NNS refusal strategies". Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, Vol. 9, Pp. 47-82.
- Kreutel, K. (2007): "I'm not agree with you." ESL Learners' Expressions of Disagreement." Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language (TESL-EJ), Vol. 11, No. 3, Pp. 1-35.

- Eslami-Rasekh, Z. (2004): "The Effect of Explicit Metapragmatic Instruction on the Speech Act Awareness of Advanced EFL Students." Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language (TESL-EJ), Vol. 8, No. 2, Pp.1-12.
- Fukuya, J. & K. Clark (2001): "A comparison of input enhancement and explicit instruction of mitigators". In Bouton, L. (Ed.), Pragmatics and language learning monograph series (Vol. 10, Pp. 111-130). Urbana-Champaign: Division of English as an International Language: University of Illinois.
- Fukuya, Y. & Y. Zhang (2002): "Effects of Recasts on EFL Learners' Acquisition of Pragmalinguistic Conventions of Request". Second Language Studies, vol. 21, No. 1, Pp. 1-47.
- Hondo, J. & Bridget, G. (2002): "Cross Cultural Varieties of Politeness." Texas papers in Foreign Language education, Vol. 6, No. 1, Pp. 163-170.
- Horecký, J. (1996): "The content and form of illocutionary acts". In Barbara, P. & P. Sgall (eds.), Discourse and Meaning, Pp. 63-68.

- Cedar, P. (2006): "Thai and American Responses to Compliments in English". The Linguistics Journal, Vol. 1, No. 2, Pp. 6-28.
- Daniel, S. (1992): "Issues in Teaching Pragmatics, prosody, and Non-Verbal Communication". Applied Linguistics, Vol. 13, No. 3, Pp. 259-281.
- Dogancay, S. (1990): "'Your Eye is Sparkling': Formulaic Expressions and Routines in Turkish". WPEL, Vol. 6, No. 2, Pp. 49-64.
- Erton, I. (2007): "Applied Pragmatics and Competence Relations in Language Learning and Teaching." Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, Vol.3, No.1, Pp. 59-71.
- Ellis, R. (1992): "Learning to Communicate in the Classroom: A Study of two language Learners' Requests." Studies in second Language Acquisition, Vol. 14, No. 1, Pp. 1-23.
- Edwards, M. & C. Kata (2004): "Developing Pragmatic Competence in the EFL Classroom". English Teaching Forum, Vol. 42, No. 3, Pp. 16-21.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Al-Eryani, A. (2007): "Refusal Strategies by Yemeni EFL Learners". The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly, Vol. 9, No. 2, Pp. 19-34.
- Al-Khatib, M. (2006): "The pragmatics of invitation making and acceptance in Jordanian society". Journal of Language and Linguistics, Vol. 5, No. 2, Pp. 272-294.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. & Rebecca Mahan-Taylor (2003): Teaching Pragmatics. Washington DC: U.S. Department of State Office of English Language Programs. Available online at <http://exchanges.state.gov/education/engteaching/pragmatics.htm>
- Bardovi-Harling, K. et al. (1991): "Developing Pragmatic Awareness: closing the conversation". ELT Journal, Vol. 45, No. 1, Pp. 4-15.
- Billmyer, K. (1990). "I really like your lifestyle: ESL learners learning how to compliment". Penn Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, Vol. 6, No. 2, Pp. 31-48.

(II) Further research is needed to investigate practical classroom-based techniques of developing EFL pragmatic competence.

(III) Further research is needed to investigate practical classroom-based techniques of teaching EFL culture.

(IV) More descriptive studies are needed to identify the similarities and differences between the realization patterns of speech acts in Egyptian Arabic and in English.

(V) More descriptive studies are needed to assess how far pragmatic transfer between Egyptian Arabic and English is possible.

Recommendations:

(I) Direct and explicit teaching of English pragmatics should be integrated into the EFL curriculum from the very beginning.

(II) Enriching classroom input with real-world materials which may facilitate acquisition of the pragmatic competence, such as recordings of native speaker conversations, radio programs, and even television soap operas.

(III) Presenting our students from the early beginning of their EFL learning with material that cater for metapragmatic information including discussions of register, illocutionary force, politeness and the rules of appropriate language use.

(IV) Teaching the target language culture in our EFL classrooms through intertwining cultural elements with language itself.

(2) Suggestions for Further Research:

(I) Replication of this study with other speech acts.

displayed a high awareness of the social functions of different speech acts, the significance of different degrees of indirectness, the formulation of appropriate speech acts, the use of appropriate linguistic items and the use of appropriate politeness.

Generally, these findings support the claim raised by several researchers; (Kasper (1997), Silva (2003) and Martinez et al. (2006) among others) that SL/FL pragmatics is teachable and that explicit metapragmatic instruction facilitates developing pragmatic competence.

In addition, the findings of this study addressed the somewhat controversial issue of whether explicit classroom-centered instruction has any effect on SL/FL pragmatic development. As indicated by these results, pragmatic teaching and learning is ecologically valid in actual EFL/ESL classroom settings and pragmatic competence can indeed be systematically developed through well-planned classroom activities.

measures awareness of speech acts used in complaints and apologies. This implies that subjects' awareness of the speech acts of apologizing, accepting apologies and making complaints underwent a considerable growth as a result of attending the direct instruction afforded by the suggested program. These results confirm the results of Olshtain & Cohen (1990), Morrow (1996), Tateyama (2001) and Pearson (2001) who concluded that direct teaching of the pragmatics of the speech acts of apologizing, accepting apologies and making complaints had its positive effects on students' pragmatic ability.

These high gains shown by the subjects on a pre-test, posttest comparison are due to the effect of the systematic instruction and training that subjects had, and the especially prepared and appropriately tuned authentic materials used in the suggested program.

Students' post performance on the four areas of the pragmatic awareness test displayed enhanced pragmatic knowledge and a considerable pragmatic ability to make informed decisions in their pragmatic choices; they

Table (4). Means, Standard Deviations and "t" value of the Scores of the Subjects on the Fourth Area of the Pragmatic Awareness Test in the Pre-post Administration.

Administration	No.	Mean	SD	"t" value	Significance
Pre.	35	4.1429	1.927	11.29	0.01
Post.	35	7.2857	1.994		

A pre-posttest comparison of the scores of the study subjects on the fourth area of the pragmatic awareness test was in favor of the post assessment. Means of scores of the subjects in the posttest were significantly higher than those of the pre-test. Subjects got a higher mean (7.2857) in the post test than that obtained in the pre test (4.1429). "t" value (11.29) revealed a highly significant difference between means of scores of the subjects on the pre-test, posttest basis, see table (4).

These findings indicate that the subjects' post assessment scores surpassed their pre-assessment scores on the fourth area of the pragmatic awareness test that

awareness of speech acts used in requests and invitations. This implies that subjects' awareness of the speech acts of making requests, extending invitations and declining an invitation underwent a considerable growth as a result of receiving the explicit instruction afforded by the suggested program. These results support the results of King & Silver (1993), Overfield (1996), LoCastro (1997), Kondo (2001), Fukuya & Clark (2001) and Takahashi (2001). All these studies concluded that explicit metapragmatic instruction of the speech acts of making requests, extending invitations and declining an invitation enhanced pragmatic awareness of these speech acts among their subjects.

Answer to the Fourth sub-question:

'What is the effect of a suggested pragmatics-based program on EFL majors' pragmatic awareness of the speech acts used in complaints and apologies?'

Table (3). Means, Standard Deviations and "t" value of the Scores of the Subjects on the Third Area of the Pragmatic Awareness Test in the Pre-post Administration.

<i>Administration</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>"t" value</i>	<i>Significance</i>
Pre.	35	3.8857	1.605	11.06	0.01
Post.	35	7.5143	2.020		

A pre-posttest comparison of the scores of the study subjects on the third area of the pragmatic awareness test was in favor of the post assessment. Means of scores of the subjects in the posttest were significantly higher than those of the pre-test. Subjects got a higher mean (7.5143) in the post test than that obtained in the pre test (3.8857). "t" value (11.06) revealed a highly significant difference between means of scores of the subjects on the pre-test, posttest basis, see table (3).

These findings indicate that the subjects' post assessment scores surpassed their pre-assessment scores on the third area of the pragmatic awareness test that measures

measures awareness of speech acts used in conversations. This implies that subjects' awareness of the speech acts of giving a compliment, responding to a compliment and closing a conversation underwent a considerable growth as a result of receiving the explicit instruction in the suggested program. These results go in line with those of Billmyer (1990), LoCastro (2000) and Rose & Ng Kwain-fun (2001), who concluded that pragmatic awareness of the speech acts of giving and responding to compliments and closing a conversation was highly developed as a result of direct and explicit metapragmatic instruction.

Answer to the Third sub-question:

'What is the effect of a suggested pragmatics-based program on EFL majors' pragmatic awareness of the speech acts used in requests and invitations?'

Table (2). Means, Standard Deviations and "t" value of the Scores of the Subjects on the Second Area of the Pragmatic Awareness Test in the Pre-post Administration.

<i>Administration</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>"t" value</i>	<i>Significance</i>
Pre.	35	2.6286	1.285	10.66	0.01
Post.	35	5.6857	1.795		

A pre-posttest comparison of the scores of the study subjects on the second area of the pragmatic awareness test was in favor of the post assessment. Means of scores of the subjects in the posttest were significantly higher than those of the pre-test. Subjects got a higher mean (5.6857) in the post test than that obtained in the pre test (2.6286). "t" value (10.66) revealed a highly significant difference between means of scores of the subjects on the pre-test, posttest basis, see table (2).

These findings indicate that the subjects' post assessment scores outperformed their pre-assessment scores on the second area of the pragmatic awareness test that

awareness of speech acts used in discussions. This implies that subjects' awareness of the speech acts of making suggestions and disagreements underwent a significant development as a result of receiving direct and explicit teaching in the suggested program. These findings affirm those of Silva (2003) and Koike & Pearson (2005) who concluded that explicit instruction had positive effects on the development of the pragmatic awareness of the speech acts of making suggestions and disagreements.

Answer to the Second sub-question:

'What is the effect of a suggested pragmatics-based program on EFL majors' pragmatic awareness of the speech acts used in conversations?'

Table (1). Means, Standard Deviations and "t" value of the Scores of the Subjects on the First Area of the Pragmatic Awareness Test in the Pre-post Administration.

<i>Administration</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>"t" value</i>	<i>Significance</i>
Pre.	35	2.1714	1.098	10.36	0.01
Post.	35	4.1143	1.051		

A pre-posttest comparison of the scores of the study subjects on the first area of the pragmatic awareness test was in favor of the post assessment. Means of scores of the subjects in the posttest were significantly higher than those of the pre-test. Subjects got a higher mean (4.1143) in the post test than that obtained in the pre test (2.1714). "t" value (10.36) revealed a highly significant difference between means of scores of the subjects on the pre-test, posttest basis, see table (1).

These findings indicate that the subjects' post assessment scores surpassed their pre-assessment scores on the first area of the pragmatic awareness test that measures

FINDINGS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

(1) Findings and Discussion:

This section attempts to answer the third question of the study through comparing subjects' pre and post measurement scores, and then discusses the results obtained. The third question of the study that asked '*What is the effect of a suggested pragmatics-based program on EFL majors' pragmatic competence?*', was divided, as mentioned before, into three sub-questions. Answers to these sub-questions are given below;

Answer to the first sub-question:

'What is the effect of a suggested pragmatics-based program on EFL majors' pragmatic awareness of the speech acts used in discussions?'

On 5th February, the researcher started teaching the suggested programme. Teaching lasted for about 10 weeks; almost a lesson per week. That's to say, each speech act was taught in four hours. Thus, the total time of teaching the suggested program was (52) fifty two hours.

(3) Post-Testing:

Upon finishing teaching the suggested programme, on 17th April, and after reacquainting the subjects with the objectives of the pre-post test and the way to respond to its items, the pre-post awareness test was re-administered to the subjects as a post-test. During re-administration of the test, subjects' questions and inquiries about the test were also answered till they finished.

(4) Statistical analysis of data:

After finishing post-assessment procedures, a "t" test for small samples was used to analyze the differences between means of scores of the study subjects in the Pre and the Post-measurements.

(8) Test Instructions.

The instructions of this test were given in simple and comprehensible English written in a separate sheet. These instructions provided students with information on the purpose of the test, the time allowed, test items and how to finish it.

PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY:

Conducting the present study went through the following steps:

(1) Pre-Testing:

On 4th February, 2007, a day before starting teaching the suggested program, 4th-year EFL majors, the subjects of the present study, were assembled and acquainted with the objectives of the pre-post test and the way to finish it. After that, the pre-post pragmatic awareness test was administered to the study subjects as a pre-test. During the administration, subjects' questions and inquiries about the test were fully answered till they finished.

(2) Teaching the suggested program:

(5) *Test Validity.*

Content and face validity of the test was determined by a panel of TEFL experts. In addition, statistical validity was calculated from the root square of the test stability coefficient. It was found (0.92). This value means that the test is highly valid.

(6) *Test reliability.*

The test reliability was calculated by administering it to a piloting group that included (20) 4th-year EFL majors, excluded from the main study by using the test re-test method. The results from the two tests were then correlated to produce a stability coefficient. The stability coefficient was found to be ($r=.84$).

(7) *Test Duration.*

To determine the time to be allowed for finishing this test, a try-out of it to the same piloting group was done. This pilot administration indicated that the average time for finishing this test was a session of (90) minutes. Thus, (90) minutes were decided on to be the optimum time for finishing this test.

the fourth and last area was about the speech acts used in complaints & apologies, measured by items (1,2,4,8,12,15,19,21,24,29,30,33). Thus, the test included 39 items.

(3) Item Type.

The test items were designed in a multiple choice format. Each item included a situation followed by four alternatives or choices from which the student was to choose the most pragmatically appropriate choice; The most appropriate choice is the one that reflects pragmatic awareness, with respect to the given situation, in the following areas: (a) formulation of appropriate speech act; (b) use of appropriate linguistic items; (c) use of appropriate level of directness; and (d) use of appropriate politeness.

(4) Scoring.

Student's score was simply the number of correct answers that he/she gave; there was no added penalty for wrong answers. One mark was given to each correct test item. Thus the test maximum score was 39 marks.

- (f) Demonstrate pragmatic awareness of the speech act of requesting.
- (g) Demonstrate pragmatic awareness of the speech act of extending invitations.
- (h) Demonstrate pragmatic awareness of the speech act of declining an invitation.
- (i) Demonstrate pragmatic awareness of the speech act of apologizing.
- (j) Demonstrate pragmatic awareness of the speech act of accepting apologies.
- (k) Demonstrate pragmatic awareness of the speech act of complaining.

(2) *Construction of the Test.*

Four main areas were specified to be measured by this test. The first area was about *the speech acts used in discussions*, measured by items (5,6,9,16,36,39), the second area was about *the speech acts used in conversations*, measured by items (3,7,14,25,26,31,32,35,38), the third area was about *the speech acts used in requests & invitations*, measured by items (10,11,13,17,18,20,22,23,27,28,34,37),

(1) *Objectives of the Test.*

Objectives of the present test were based on the objectives of the suggested programme. Therefore, the present test aimed at measuring the pragmatic awareness of 4th year EFL majors of the speech acts used in four main areas; discussions, conversations, requests & invitations and complaints & apologies. More specifically, the present test aimed at measuring the ability of 4th year EFL majors to:

- (a) Demonstrate pragmatic awareness of the speech act of suggesting.
- (b) Demonstrate pragmatic awareness of the speech act of disagreeing.
- (c) Demonstrate pragmatic awareness of the speech act of giving a compliment.
- (d) Demonstrate pragmatic awareness of the speech act of responding to Compliments.
- (e) Demonstrate pragmatic awareness of the speech act of closing a conversation.

(4) Evaluation:

Being essential, evaluation was dealt with in this program as a methodological activity and as an on-going process. It was not delayed to the end of the program. It was planned to provide students with the opportunity to evaluate their own success in using the target speech act. This was done through a variety of ways; choosing the appropriate answer from multiple choice questions, reading a conversation and spotting the expressions used to realize a respective speech act or reading situations then responding to them by writing the most appropriate responses.

(II) A Pre-post Pragmatic Awareness Test (prepared by the researcher).

A pre-post situational test was prepared by the researcher. The test consisted of a set of thirty nine situations. All the situations were placed in different contexts and reflected different social constraints; different social distances between interlocutors and their status relative to each other.

pragmatic features they might have observed from the audio clip to help them role-play. When finished, two pairs or more were chosen to perform in front of the whole class. The teacher was ready to clear up any misconceptions about pragmatic routines and language choices and to provide corrective feedback. Sociopragmatic or paralinguistic deviations observed in students' performances were taken as teaching points and pertinent metapragmatic information or comments were provided to the whole class.

- **Individual Work**

Individual work was done through dialogue completion tasks. In these dialogues, students had the opportunity to work individually and independently assuming greater responsibility for their learning and producing the language they had learned. They were asked to complete a given dialogue based on the speech act in focus. When finished, they were provided by corrective feedback.

different forms depending on contextual variables. In addition, students were taught politeness markers relevant to each speech act in English compared with their counterparts in Egyptian Arabic. Through comparing the way a speech act is realized in English with the way it is realized in Egyptian Arabic, students had the opportunity to best understand the pragmatics of the target language.

(3) Practice:

In this phase of the lesson, students were given the opportunity to use the target speech act in dialogic practice tasks, individually or in communicative-pairs set up by the teacher. These tasks allowed students to build confidence in using the speech act in the safe confines of the classroom.

- **Pair Work**

In this step, students were paired up to role-play a situation similar to the one/ones they listened to in each lesson. They were reminded to apply the rules discussed in class and also to use conventional routines and other

pragmatic features they might have observed from the clip with their equivalents in Egyptian Arabic. In addition students were asked to tell what they would say, given a similar situation in Arabic; would they use the same words or verbal forms? How different would they do it? Upon finishing small group discussion, students were invited to a whole class discussion of the conclusions of each small group.

(2) Explicit Instruction:

In this phase, students had the opportunity to better comprehend what they had listened to in the audio clip. They were directly and explicitly taught the pragmatic aspects encountered; the grammatical, pragmalinguistic and sociolinguistic rules of the target language, when and why certain linguistic practices take place and the various meanings a single utterance might convey in different contexts. They were also provided with examples of different speech acts emphasizing the fact that a specific form can have several functions in the language and one function can be realized through

look at the language forms and realization patterns appropriate for each task type.

- **Comprehension Questions on the audio clip:**

Following listening to the audio clip, students were asked to answer some comprehension questions on the audio clip they had listened to. This was done as an attempt to assess students' understanding of what they listened to; whether they listen casually or they listen with comprehension and to attract their attention to the speech act in focus.

- **Metapragmatic Discussion:**

In this step, students were asked to work in small groups, under the supervision of the teacher, to discover the parameters relevant to the speech act in focus, the different realization patterns and the mitigation devices or face-saving strategies used with the respective speech act. Students were also asked to compare the parameters and the realization patterns of the respective speech act with their counterparts in Egyptian Arabic. Also, they were asked to compare conventional routines and other

(c) Teaching Methodology:

Teaching the program involved four stages: presentation, explicit instruction, practice and evaluation.

(1) Presentation:

The purpose of this phase was to present the speech act in focus to the students. This was done through using the following presentation techniques;

- **Listening to an audio clip:**

Through listening to authentic language dialogues representative of potential situations and performed by native speakers, students had the opportunity to look at the parameters that guide appropriate linguistic choice; (1) the relationship between interlocutors (either informality/non-distance, or formality/distance), and (2) the task type (for each speech act, at least two task levels can usually be identified; for example: requests can be easy or difficult to comply with; invitations can be to a casual or a more formal event; apologies can follow a minor or a major offense). At the same time, students

Unit One: Discussions	
Lesson One	Making Suggestions
Lesson Two	Making Disagreements
Unit Two: Conversations	
Lesson One	Giving Compliments
Lesson Two	Responding to Compliments
Lesson Three	Closing a Conversation
Unit Three: Requests & Invitations	
Lesson One	Making Requests
Lesson Two	Extending Formal Invitations
Lesson Three	Extending Informal Invitations
Lesson Four	Declining an Invitation
Unit Four: Complaints & Apologies	
Lesson One	Apologizing
Lesson Two	Accepting apologies
Lesson Three	Making Formal Complaints
Lesson Four	Making Informal Complaints

(11) Developing EFL majors' pragmatic awareness of the speech act of complaining.

(2) *Content of the Programme.*

The content of the programme was designed in the light of its objectives. It consisted of a teacher's guide book and a student's book. It comprised four units that were to cover the eleven (11) objectives of the program. Each unit dealt with a different area of speech acts. The four units included thirteen (13) lessons that were to cover the objectives of the programme;

- (1) Developing EFL majors' pragmatic awareness of the speech act of suggesting.
- (2) Developing EFL majors' pragmatic awareness of the speech act of disagreeing.
- (3) Developing EFL majors' pragmatic awareness of the speech act of giving a compliment.
- (4) Developing EFL majors' pragmatic awareness of responding to Compliments.
- (5) Developing EFL majors' pragmatic awareness of the speech act of closing a conversation.
- (6) Developing EFL majors' pragmatic awareness of the speech act of requesting.
- (7) Developing EFL majors' pragmatic awareness of the speech act of making invitations.
- (8) Developing EFL majors' pragmatic awareness of the speech act of declining an invitation.
- (9) Developing EFL majors' pragmatic awareness of the speech act of apologizing.
- (10) Developing EFL majors' pragmatic awareness of the speech act of accepting apologies.

Objectives of the present programme were specified in the light of the analysis of the EFL majors' needs of training in speech acts. Analysis of their needs indicated that there were eleven speech acts EFL majors' should be trained in. These eleven speech acts constituted the objectives of the programme the researcher intended to achieve. They were classified into; *unit objectives* and *lesson objectives*. The lesson objectives were divided, in turn, into behavioural objectives.

(a) Unit objectives:

- (1) Developing EFL majors' pragmatic awareness of the speech acts used in discussions?
- (2) Developing EFL majors' pragmatic awareness of the speech acts used in conversations?
- (3) Developing EFL majors' pragmatic awareness of the speech acts used in requests and invitations?
- (4) Developing EFL majors' pragmatic awareness of the speech acts used in complaints and apologies?

(b) Lesson Objectives:

(2) Judging the validity of the list by a panel of TEFL experts as for:

- Stating
- Importance
- Frequency of use in daily communications
- Trainability

(3) Stating general objectives and deriving behavioral objectives out of the general objectives.

(4) Judging the validity of the objectives by a panel of TEFL experts.

(5) Building the frame of the program including objectives, content areas, activities and evaluation tools.

(6) Judging the frame of the program by a panel of TEFL experts.

(7) Building the whole program including a Teacher's Guidebook and a Student's book.

(8) Judging the validity of the program by the same panel of TEFL experts.

(b) Description of the Programme:

(1) Objectives of the Programme.

experiment was 35 4th year EFL majors at the New Valley Faculty of Education, Assiut University.

Experimental Design:

The study had a one group pretest-posttest design. The group was pre tested by using a pre-post pragmatic comprehension test. Then, a pragmatics-based program for developing EFL majors' pragmatic competence was taught, after that, the group was post tested by using the same pre-post test.

Tools of the Study:

Achieving the aim of the current study required preparing the following tools;

(I) A Pragmatics-based Program.

A program for developing 4th-year EFL majors' pragmatic competence was designed. Designing the program went through the following procedures;

(a) Designing procedures:

(1) Building a list of speech acts through reviewing pertinent literature and related studies.

illustrate this giving an example that a sentence would have the illocutionary force of ordering if and only if the speaker intends to impose an obligation by getting the hearer to recognize this intention.

According to Horecký (1996: 64), the notion of illocutionary force is not defined verbally, but rather by "the set of seven components, namely: intention, mode of implementation, force, conditions of a propositional content, preparative conditions, conditions of success and the degree of success of the illocutionary act".

METHOD:

Subjects of the Study:

All 4th year EFL majors at the New Valley faculty of Education, Assiut University volunteered to participate in this study. Both male and female students were among the participants. Upon excluding drop outs, who missed one or more of the following: the pre-test, the treatment or the post-test at the end of the experiment, the number of the subjects who successfully completed the

Illocutionary act:

For Searle & Vanderveken (1985: 1-2), an illocutionary act is a complete speech act, made in a typical utterance, that consists of; (a) the delivery of the propositional content of the utterance (including references and a predicate), and; (b) a particular illocutionary force, whereby the speaker asserts, suggests, demands, promises, or vows. For Horecký (1996: 64), the illocutionary act is "the act by which something is uttered about reality, the act carrying the content (proposition) of utterance as a basic communicative sign".

Illocutionary force:

Each speech act has an illocutionary force that can be defined as "an attempt to use words in order to perform an interpersonal function" (Ellis, 1992: 3). In this sense, taxonomies of illocutionary acts have been based on the various communicative language functions that occur in speech and in writing. Examples of these illocutions are compliments, apologies, requests, refusals, complaints, suggestions and thanking. Raffaella & Portner (2003),

target language society". In the present study, pragmatic competence means the ability of 4th year EFL majors to use English language appropriately in terms of the social functions of different speech acts, the significance of different degrees of indirectness, the use of appropriate linguistic items and the use of appropriate politeness markers.

Speech Act:

For Yule (1996: 132), the "act performed by a speaker in uttering a sentence" is referred to as a speech act. It covers actions such as requesting, commanding, questioning and informing. In other words, a speech act is what a speaker uses language for or what he/she intends us to take or interpret the function of what he/she says. According to Al-Eryani (2007: 19-20), Speech acts can be thought of as 'functions' of language, such as complaining, thanking, apologizing, refusing, requesting, and inviting.

study of the invisible meaning or how we recognize what is meant even when it isn't actually said (or written). In order for that to happen, speakers (and writers) must be able to depend on a lot of shared assumptions and expectations.

Pragmatic Comprehension:

"Pragmatic comprehension refers to the comprehension of oral language in terms of pragmatic meaning" (Paula, 2004: 1).

Pragmatic Competence:

Pragmatic competence comprises two types; sociolinguistic competence and discourse competence. Sociolinguistic competence is the ability to interpret the social meaning of a linguistic item and to decide and use language in an appropriate social meaning for communicative purposes. Discourse competence deals with the ability to arrange sentences into cohesive structures. (Erton, 2007: 61-64).

For Kreutel (2007: 1), pragmatic competence is "the ability to use language according to the cultural norms of the

the focus of the suggested program. The rationales behind this selection was, firstly, the fact that these speech acts are observed most frequently in daily communications of any speaker and, thus, are worth paying attention to in any needs analysis of second/foreign language learners. Secondly, these speech acts are the most empirically-explored speech acts in the cross-cultural or interlanguage pragmatics literature and, therefore, could easily be incorporated into explicit metapragmatic instruction.

DEFINITION OF TERMS:

Pragmatics:

According to Crystal (1985: 240), "Pragmatics is the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication" (Cited in Kasper, 1997: 1).

As for Yule (1996: 127), Pragmatics is the study of the "intended speaker meaning". In other words, it is the

(3.2) What is the effect of a suggested pragmatics-based program on EFL majors' pragmatic awareness of the speech acts used in conversations?

(3.3) What is the effect of a suggested pragmatics-based program on EFL majors' pragmatic awareness of the speech acts used in requests and invitations?

(3.4) What is the effect of a suggested pragmatics-based program on EFL majors' pragmatic awareness of the speech acts used in complaints and apologies?

DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY:

1. The study was limited to 4th year EFL majors at the New Valley Faculty of Education, Assiut University as the suggested program was intended to help them before their graduation, lest they might not have another chance to develop their pragmatic competence.
2. The speech acts of apologizing, accepting apologies, giving compliments, responding to compliments, extending invitations, declining an invitation, disagreeing, requesting, making suggestions, complaining and closing a conversation were selected as

speakers of English. This is due to their inability to figure out the norms of appropriateness for various speech acts and different interlocutors in the target culture. That's to say, they can not use pragmatically appropriate language. Hence, the present study is an attempt to design a program that may help develop EFL majors' pragmatic competence. More specifically, the study attempts to answer the following questions;

- (1) What are the speech acts that EFL majors need to be trained in?
- (2) What is the suggested framework of a pragmatics-based program that develops EFL majors' pragmatic competence?
- (3) What is the effect of a suggested pragmatics-based program on EFL majors' pragmatic competence?

The third question is divided into the following sub-questions;

- (3.1) What is the effect of a suggested pragmatics-based program on EFL majors' pragmatic awareness of the speech acts used in discussions?

appropriate language use. Enriching classroom input with real-world materials which may facilitate acquisition of the pragmatic competence, such as recordings of native speaker conversations, radio programs, and even television soap operas is left to EFL teachers' individual endeavors. To the contrary, lexical and grammatical knowledge are the most emphasized aspects in our EFL textbooks.

While talking to native speakers of English our EFL majors appear discourteous and rude. Trying to get the meaning across, they simply translate speech acts from Arabic, their mother tongue, to the English language. This is due to their poor pragmatic competence; that is, they are not aware of the social, cultural, and discourse conventions that have to be followed in various situations.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM:

EFL majors at the New Valley Faculty of Education, Assiut University appear harsh, too direct and even rude while they are involved in communication with native

divided into three groups and given a multiple choice test and a sentence-combining test. In one group, the explanations of rules were given by a teacher; in the second, consciousness-raising tasks evolved from group discussion. The third group was a control. All subjects received a pre-test and post-tests. Results indicated that experimental groups generated significantly better responses. Results also showed that teaching conversational implicature through explicit explanations of rules and consciousness-raising tasks is highly advantageous.

As can be understood, the above mentioned studies support the positive effects of instruction in pragmatics and denote that pragmatic competence is not impervious to instruction even in EFL settings.

Reviewing current EFL textbooks used in our Egyptian schools from a pragmatics perspective, the researcher realized that they are poor in explicit metapragmatic information including discussions of register, illocutionary force, politeness and the rules of

Fukuya & Zhang (2002) investigated the effects of implicit feedback on Chinese learners of English in learning eight pragmalinguistic conventions of request. These questions are addressed; (1) Are pragmalinguistic recasts effective for teaching pragmatically appropriate requests? (2) Are they effective for teaching pragmatically appropriate and grammatically correct requests? (3) Do they boost learners' confidence in making requests? Both pragmatic recast and control groups performed role-plays; the former received recasts on their request Head Acts whereas the latter did not. The results of discourse completion tests yielded the effect sizes of the pragmatic recast group: Cohen's (1988) $d = 0.83$ for research question 1 and Cohen's $d = 0.87$ for research question 2. Both groups also built up confidence in speaking to an interlocutor of higher status, perhaps due to the interaction with the instructor and their peers. The effect of teaching of conversational English implicature was investigated by Kubota (1995) on Japanese university EFL students. Participants were

approximated native speakers in their use of syntactic structures of compliments, and utilized newly learned response strategies. Moreover, the learners reported a higher level of confidence in complimenting interactions and enhanced motivation for learning other speech acts. Silva (2003) investigated whether relatively explicit instruction may be facilitative for L2 pragmatic development, and the most appropriate and effective ways to deliver the pragmatic information to L2 learners. Adopting a pre-test/post-test design with treatment and control groups, she incorporated metapragmatic awareness into task-based methodological principles in her instructional treatment in order to teach the sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic components of the speech act of refusals. Fourteen low-intermediate learners from various L1s (Japanese, Chinese, Taiwanese, Serbian, and Portuguese) were randomly assigned to both control and treatment groups. Findings illustrated that the instructional approach enhanced the L2 pragmatic ability of performing the speech act in focus.

selected as the focus of teaching. A pretest-posttest control group design was used. The subjects included Iranian undergraduate students in their last year of study in the field of teaching English as a foreign language. A multiple choice pragmatic comprehension test was developed in several stages and used both as a pretest and posttest to measure the effect of instruction on the pragmatic comprehension of the students. Results of the data analysis indicated that explicit metapragmatic instruction has significant effects on the development of students' speech act comprehension.

Ishihara's (2004) case study explored immediate and delayed instructional effects on giving and responding to compliments in two ESL classrooms. The instruction was given to 31 intermediate adult learners. Their performance and awareness of giving and responding to compliments were described as measured before, during, immediately after, and one year after the instruction. As the instruction progressed, learners produced longer written complimenting dialogues on appropriate topics,

Mwinyelle's (2005) study investigated the effect of instructional video, metapragmatic discussion and explicit pragmatic instruction on the acquisition of the advice speech act by second language learners in fourth-semester Spanish courses at the university level. The study adopted a design including pretest, posttest, and delayed posttest with three groups, incorporating video, metapragmatic discussion, and pragmatic instruction into its treatments in order to teach sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic components of the Spanish advice. The findings of the investigation indicated that the instructional approach that included the use of video, metapragmatic discussion and pragmatic instruction enabled the learners in this particular group to perform better than the other two groups in acquiring L2 pragmatic competence of the Spanish advice.

The study of Eslami-Rasekh (2004) explored the effect of explicit metapragmatic instruction on the speech act comprehension of advanced EFL students. The speech acts of requesting, apologizing, and complaining were

L2 pragmatic acquisition and interlanguage pragmatic development is, as Kasper (2001a, 2001b) claims, still limited (Cited in Silva, 2003: 56). These studies have concluded that L2 pragmatics is teachable and hence their results and those of other similar ones lend support for the present study. A brief review of some of these studies is given below;

The study of Koike & Pearson (2005) examined the effectiveness of teaching pragmatic information through the use of explicit or implicit pre-instruction, and explicit or implicit feedback, to English-speaking learners of third-semester Spanish. Results on a pre-test, post-test and a delayed post-test revealed that the study subjects, who received instruction and feedback, whether explicit or implicit, appear to become aware of a greater number of options to express suggestions. These findings indicated that using pragmatic instruction in the classroom to develop pragmatic competence is highly effective.

(1997: 4) claims, "without some form of instruction, many aspects of pragmatic competence do not develop sufficiently".

Inspiring foreign language teachers with the hope that pragmatics can be taught and learned, Linnell et al. (1992: 33) state that direct instruction of pragmatics may be a shortcut to learning sociolinguistic rules of the target language shorter than just mingling in the target culture. For Silva (2003: 56), "instruction on L2 pragmatics is necessary at every level of language proficiency". Confirming the same view point, Martinez et al. (2006: 600) assure that "the role of instruction in teaching pragmatic competence is extremely vital" and that "pragmatics can be taught and learned outside of the target culture".

As a matter of fact, a large body of second/foreign language acquisition research of the experimental and quasi-experimental effects of instruction type has appeared in the past decade. However, the number of studies which have attempted to investigate instructed

misunderstandings and communication problems. Bardovi-Harling et al. (1991: 4) stressed the importance of pragmatic competence and pointed out the undesired consequences of lacking it saying "speakers who do not use pragmatically appropriate language run the risk of appearing uncooperative at the least, or , more seriously, rude or insulting". For Linnell et al. (1992: 34), speakers lacking pragmatic competence may be thought of as "rude or slow or difficult" and that "this type of thinking produces or reinforces existing cultural stereotypes, encouraging racism and discrimination". Nakajima (1997: 50) adds that "if non-native speakers transfer their native language pragmatics and/or cultural norms into the target language, their utterances may not achieve their goals due to sociolinguistic inappropriateness.

It is true that some pragmatic knowledge is universal and other aspects may be successfully transferred from the learners' mother language and therefore non-native speakers can get a considerable amount of target language pragmatic knowledge for free. Yet, as Kasper

Although the textbook is the heart of the curriculum in most EFL classrooms and it is the primary (if not the only) source of linguistic input, hardly ever does it present adequate information for learners to effectively develop their pragmatic competence. Vellenga (2004) put it clear that "learning pragmatics from textbooks is highly unlikely". Supporting this view point, Edwards & Kata (2004: 17) state that despite the importance of their role in raising students' pragmatic awareness, "textbooks usually fail to provide the necessary and appropriate input in speech acts, and the material they do present often differs from real life speech".

Due to this negligence, gaining pragmatic competence for most learners of a foreign or a second language is challenging. Nakajima (1997: 50) relates this negligence to the fact that unlike the grammatical competence, "pragmatic competence cannot be clearly judged as correct or incorrect according to prescriptive rules".

It is worth mentioning that lack of the pragmatic competence most probably leads to serious

norms, different rules that govern the use of each language in context and different patterns of discourse. Therefore, what can be seen as a polite behavior in one culture may not be seen so in the other. Hence, mastery of pragmatic competence must be an essential learning objective for FL/SL learners.

Unfortunately, most EFL/ESL classrooms are impoverished learning environments for learners to develop their pragmatic competence. Mapping the communicative actions in classic language classroom discourse against the pragmatic competence that nonnative speakers need to communicate in the world outside, Kasper (1997) emphasizes that "the language classroom in its classical format does not offer students what they need- not in terms of teacher's input, nor in terms of students' productive language use". According to Kubota (1995: 3), "teaching pragmatic competence is considered to be one of the neglected aspects in English language teaching in Japan".

In another study, Nelson et al. (1993) reported that for Egyptians, compliments function to contribute to interpersonal or group solidarity. They also found differences between Egyptian speakers and American English speakers in that Egyptians, compared with Americans, frequently express compliments regarding natural appearances and personal traits; who the person *is*, and not what they *do*. Also, Egyptians do not offer compliments as frequently as do Americans. Nelson et al. suggest that this may be in part due to the Arab belief in the "evil eye," or the potential for compliments to bring bad luck. Egyptians use a large number of similes, metaphors, and preceding ritualized phrases such as "Eeh l-Halaawa di!" (What is all this beauty!). In addition, Nelson et al. suggest that Egyptians prefer a direct approach to giving compliments while they exercise indirect approaches for negative feelings as a mature way to save face (Cited in Hondo & Bridget 2001: 165). Thus, the above review of current literature on Arabic-English-Interlanguage pragmatics reveals different social

order by preceding "regret" in the first position giving more direct refusals.

In an attempt to systemize the various strategies used for the purpose of inviting in Jordanian society; and to highlight the socio-pragmatic constraints governing their use, Al-Khatib (2006) examined three major aspects of inviting; inviting, accepting an invitation and declining it. Results indicated that Jordanian Arabic has a special patterning of inviting that can be understood and appreciated only by people sharing the same socio-cultural background.

Nelson et al. (2002) investigated the similarities and differences between Egyptian Arabic and US English communication style by focusing on the speech act of making refusals. Results suggested that both Egyptians and Americans use similar strategies with similar frequency in making refusals. They differ, however, in the frequency of indirect strategies with Egyptian males using less indirection than Americans.

Arabic-English-Interlanguage pragmatics research illustrates the nature of the Arabic language from a pragmatics perspective. A few available illustrative studies are detailed below;

Al-Eryani (2007) compared the speech act of refusing as made by Yemeni learners of English as a foreign language with American English native speakers. Results indicated that although a similar range of refusal strategies were available to the two language groups; cross-cultural variation was evident in the frequency and content of semantic formulas used by each language group in relation to the contextual variables, which include the status of interlocutors (higher, equal, or lower status). For instance, Yemeni Arabic native speakers tended to be less direct in their refusals by offering preceding "reasons" or "explanations" (in the first position of the semantic formula order) other than their own desire in refusing. American English native speakers, on the other hand, used different semantic

Chinese culture, the differences in politeness behavior between high-context and low-context cultures. According to Hall (1977) high-context cultures such as Chinese tend to stress the use of internalized or implicit message while low-context cultures tend to emphasize the use of explicit messages. In other words, in Chinese culture, the message may have some shared implied meanings that may go beyond the linguistic forms used in the message (cited in Yunxia & Thompson 2000).

The Arabic language, as seen by Cohen (1987, 1990), reflects a high-context culture, in which what is not said is sometimes more important than what is said. English, on the other hand, reflects a low context culture in which words represent truth. In Arabic, directness is much disliked so that great pains will be taken to avoid saying no and that circumlocution, ambiguity, and metaphor help to cushion against the danger of candor. In contrast, Cohen claims that Americans prefer communicating straight from the shoulder, stating explicitly what has to be said (Cited in Nelson et al. 2002: 40).

on a true story that took place at a university in Australia. The Chinese tutor phoned his student saying": I would like to invite you to our new year's party to be held in my house this Saturday evening." The student replied "This Saturday? I am afraid I won't be able to make it because I am going to my best friend's birthday party." About two hours later, the Chinese tutor rang his student a second time, asking if it was still possible for her to consider attending the Saturday party. Late in the evening around 9.00 pm the Chinese tutor rang her yet again to invite her to the party, saying it would be OK even if she stayed just for a short while. The next day, the female student lodged a complaint with the Dean, alleging that the tutor's repeated calls constituted sexual harassment. The Chinese tutor was highly distressed to learn of the complaint, and explained that he just wanted to indicate sincerity and warmth as required by an invitation, and had no other intentions.

The communication breakdown in this case, is related to an intercultural interaction between the Australian and

use of language in context vary from culture to culture and from language to language (Al-Eryani 2007; Cedar 2006; Al-Khatib 2006; Nelson et al. 2002; Yunxia & Thompson 2000; among others). "Context includes the values which a society attaches to given behaviors or concepts, the shared knowledge, relationships and goals of participants in a given interaction, and the expectations which such knowledge, relationships, and goals generate" (Daniel 1992: 260). In other words, Culture plays a major role in defining what we may and may not say, when and where we say it, to whom we say it, and why we say it.

When second/foreign language learners involve in direct communication with native speakers, a potential misunderstanding or communication breakdown may arise due to their poor pragmatic knowledge; their knowledge of what to say, how to say it, and to whom in appropriate social situations. Yunxia & Thompson (2000) gave us an example of a telephone invitation given by a Chinese tutor to an Australian female student. It is based

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

Research into second/foreign language learning has empirically established that language learning exceeds the limits of vocabulary memorization and mastering rules of grammar. Second/foreign language learners might fail to communicate effectively even if they possess a good command of the grammar rules and lexis of the target language. Supporting this view point, Kreutel (2007: 1) assures that "high lexico-grammatical proficiency does not necessarily imply high pragmatic competence". That is to say, a learner of high grammatical proficiency will not necessarily show equivalent pragmatic development (Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor 2003). In order to communicate effectively in the target language, EFL/ESL learners need to be able to match utterances with contexts in which they are appropriate. They need to be able to find socially appropriate language for the situations they encounter. On the other hand, cross-cultural research in pragmatics has documented the idea that the rules that govern the

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the effect of using a suggested pragmatics-based program on 4th year EFL Majors' pragmatic competence. The study had a one group pretest-posttest design. A group of thirty five 4th year EFL majors at the New Valley Faculty of Education, Assiut University participated in this study. Tools used in this study included; a pragmatics-based program for developing EFL majors' pragmatic competence and a pre-post pragmatic awareness test developed by the researcher for measuring EFL majors' pragmatic awareness of the intended speech acts. Experimentation lasted about two months. A "t" test for small samples was used to analyze the difference between means of scores of the study subjects in the pre and the post-measurements. Results of data analysis revealed that subjects' speech act awareness improved significantly and that pragmatic competence is not resistant to instruction in actual EFL classroom settings.



تأسست ١٩٥٧ - ٢٠٠٧
المسجون على من الهداية والتميز

كلية التربية بالوادي الجديد
المجلة العلمية

*A Suggested Pragmatics-Based Program
for Developing EFL*

Majors' Pragmatic Competence

by

Dr. Osama Hassanein Sayed

Lecturer in Curriculum and Methods of TEFL,

Faculty of Education in the New Valley,

Assiut University

(المجلد الأول - العدد الأول - يوليو ٢٠٠٨ م)