

*Investigation of Grammatical Instruction on Pragmatics of Thai EFL Learners:
A Case of 1st Year English-Major Students*

Arnunnit Manorom, Nakhon Phanom University, Thailand

The Asian Conference on Education 2018
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

Investigation of Grammatical Instruction on Pragmatics of Thai EFL Learners: A Case of 1st Year English-Major Students of Nakhon Phanom University, Thailand aims to investigate whether the grammatical instruction affects pragmatic acquisition of Thai EFL learners' scores, and to examine what types of the request speech act influence pragmatic acquisition of Thai EFL learners are. The samples are 31 students, categorized by the purposive sampling studying in the English Major at the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Science, Nakhon Phanom University. The instruments are the pretest and posttest of Discourse Completion Test (DCT), grammatical tasks, exercises, role-plays, and interviews. Statistics used in the research conduct is t-test. The results reveals that the posttest scores ($Mean = 6.39$, $SD = 2.33$) were significantly higher than the pretest scores ($Mean = 3.16$, $SD = 1.85$), indicated by $t(30) = 8.05$, $p < .05$, $d = 1.53$. The grammatical instruction used in pragmatics was effective, and the students were able to effectively improve their pragmatic acquisition ability. There are 12 types of speech acts frequently used by learners. The three most frequency used by Thai EFL learners are Attention-getter accounting for 30.28 %, Softeners accounting for 20.80 %, and Emphasis of Importance accounting for 15.90 % . The three least frequency used by Thai EFL learners are Intensifier accounting for 0.91%, Hesitators accounting for 0.31%, and Disarmers accounting for 0.31%. Pragmatic acquisition on speech act should be taught as a topic in courses and in the curriculum for longitudinal study.

Keywords: Pragmatics, Grammatical Instruction, Speech Act

iafor

The International Academic Forum
www.iafor.org

Introduction

Pragmatics have been continuously studied and developed to enhance EFL learners for decades. In reality, the uses of pragmatics are still unsuccessful in pedagogies particularly in the countries where language learners use English as a foreign language. There are several approaches based on pragmatic transfers proposed for L1 to acquire L2 properly and successfully in different ways: pragmatic transferability, pragmatic transfer development, relationship between L1 pragmatic transfer and L2 proficiency, pragmatic awareness on L1 acquiring L2, etc. Though the wide-ranged findings are found by many researchers worldwide, the longitudinal studies have constantly been conducted so as to fulfil the proper frameworks as well as methods of teaching pragmatics suitably for Second Language Acquisition. According to the previous studies, some theory approached by many researchers mentioned above, pragmatics transfer is still examined around the global. Learners should acquire the proper L2 by instructors when learners utter their conversation with native speakers. Other scholars like Harling (2001) suggested that the large effect of intensity of interaction on L2 pragmatic development is obvious when learners were given more chances to access the target expression, they are familiar with those expression. In addition, to enhance learners to learn the right ways of transferring the language appropriately, there are also other aspects influencing pragmatic acquisition of learners. Kasper and Rose (2002) stated that learners use pragmatic functions in L2 before acquisition of linguistic forms for recognition in the correlation between grammar and pragmatics. However, grammatical structure is one important feature which mainly affects how EFL learners acquire pragmatics properly and nearly in the real contexts of the native speaks. Takahashi (2017) indicated that learners who have enough grammatical knowledge tend to notice the target forms in the input and use bi-clausal form in the posttest performance. Some studies of pragmatic awareness have failed to explore how grammar interacts with various other ID factors and how these factors are concerned in the form-function analysis of the input overall.

Among the EFL learners of Nakhon Phanom educational institutions, private and public sectors, pragmatics have not primarily been put in the pedagogies overall. Consequently, learners themselves have lacked the knowledge on how to deal with the different persons and situations by using the accurate words in the social contexts—the suitable ways to utter with the persons who are at the lower, equal, and higher status. The improper communication uttered by between EFL learners to NSs, or even by Thai EFL learners and Thai instructors is probably caused by lack of language knowledge, sociocultural background, cross-cultural linguistics, etc. These have still occurred not only in pedagogies but in daily life conversations. Moreover, according to the previous class project of the SLA course in the first semester of academic year 2017 on the investigate pragmatic transfer in Thai EFL learners, the results revealed that the first year English-major students were not able to transfer L1 to L2 completely, mainly because of two factors: their L2 socio-cultural background, and grammatical structure.

Subsequently, the researcher is interested in investigating how grammatical structure instruction enhances EFL learners on pragmatic transfer in the case of the requesting speech acts.

Hypothesis

- 1). The grammatical instruction affects the scores of Thai EFL learners.
- 2). There are various types of the request speech act produced by Thai EFL learners.

Research questions

1. Does the grammatical instruction affect pragmatics of Thai EFL learners' scores?
2. What type of the request speech act influences pragmatics of Thai EFL learners?

Definitions

1. **Pragmatics:** Pragmatics are widely defined as comprehensible, problematic, conventional and sociocultural definitions (Kasper, 1998). Kasper and Rose, (2002) also pointed out that pragmatics are as the study of language use produced by the perspectives of users' utterances when they make the communication with others, they face with constraints in language use in social interaction as well as in the communication act.
2. **Speech acts:** Speech acts are what the users utter in a daily life conversation. They are not only the primary sentences when the users utter to another person but the utterances used to make communication in the various forms of requests, warnings, invitations, promises, apologies, predictions, etc. (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2007)
3. **Request:** Requests are identified as possibly face frightening acts (Brown and Levinson, 1987). It is a close relationship between the politeness degree and the indirectness degree of requests to suggest the speakers to require face work from the listeners (Butler, 1988). For the literature reviews, the study will described in the literature reviews.

Literature reviews

The Investigation of Grammatical Instruction on Pragmatics of Thai EFL Learners: A Case of the 1st Year English-Major Students of Nakhon Phanom University is concerned with four relevant issues reviewed as follows: 1) definitions of pragmatics, interlanguage pragmatics and pragmatic transfer, 2) pragmatic transfer in language proficiency, 3) pragmalinguistic awareness, and 4) effect of instruction on learners' Pragmatics awareness.

I. Definitions of Pragmatics, Interlanguage Pragmatics and Pragmatic Transfer

Pragmatic normally is the way that learners transfer their L1 into the target language properly. In other words, it is the Concepts, widely defined as comprehensible, problematic, conventional and sociocultural (Kasper, 1998). Interlanguage pragmatics are the production and comprehension of non-native speakers toward pragmatics— to look at how L1 learners acquire the L2 learners which is related to knowledge on language transfer. In addition, interlanguage pragmatics plays an important role for both instructors and learners, especially speech act intercultural misunderstanding because of L1 background towards the sociocultural norm, and convention in the target language (Takahshi, 1996).

Besides, pragmatic transfer is the sociolinguistic transfer that is the way of learners on transferring L1 sociocultural competence in the contexts of cross-linguistic influence, discourse analysis transfer —transfer of conventional features (Kasper, 1998). From another different study, interlanguage pragmatics, and pragmatic transfer are also defined as the influence, applied by learner's pragmatic knowledge of language and cultures rather than the comprehension of L2, L2 pragmatic learning as well as production (Kasper, 1992).

To sum up, pragmatics, interlanguage pragmatics and pragmatic transfer are related to second language acquisition among L2 on interference and avoidance language that is to embody the learners' competency of what the L2 is transferred or what is not transferred. In other words, it is the language influence of positive (facilitators) and negative (errors) transfer. Pragmatic transfer also involves an influence of L1 on acquiring L2 based on the various contexts of pragmatic knowledge, sociocultural, intercultural communication, and socio-linguistics as well as discourse analysis transfer.

II. Pragmatic Transfer in Language Proficiency

Pragmatic Transfer has been found in many periods for developing language proficiency of L1 to acquire L2 under particular frameworks and methods designed. In terms of language proficiency, pragmatics is necessary for learners due to the fact they inevitably interact with native speakers through their utterances; therefore, the appropriate and polite words performed by learners are the important issue in communicating successfully and avoiding confusion between the speakers and listeners. The materials and methods used to reinforce learners were developed continuously due to the misunderstanding of communication between L2 and native speakers when learners need to transfer NL or L1 to L2. In other words, there is the failure of L2 on language transfer as Thomas (1983) argued that students are overlooked by teachers to criticize impoliteness words when communicating with others. The example of negative pragmatic transfer is shown below when Japanese learned needed to express gratitude in English to a native speaker:

English Speaker: Look what I've got for you! (maybe a gift)

Japanese: Oh! I'm sorry (*thank* you does not sound sincere enough in Japanese)

English speaker: Why sorry?

Another example of Patricia (1998) states in the incorporation language of how L1 shows the negative outcomes of sociopragmatic transfer from L2 to L1 on expressing gratitude in American English using the words, *thank you*. The Puerto Rico informant living in the US for several years when she described *thank you* as the feeling of when she felt hurt and angry her father after she said "thank you" while the father was taking care of his grandchild.

As it can clearly be seen that pragmalinguistics and sociolinguistics consist of both similar and different aspects among learners when they need to transfer their native and target language. In the role of teacher, Patricia (1998) indicates that students should be assisted to be aware of and enhance pragmatic knowledge in order to transfer the suitable pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatic use in the target language.

Apart from pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatic use in the target language, after the researcher came across the literature review, there are diverse pragmatic transfer studies used for reinforcing learners' L2 proficiency proposed. The studies reviewed can be divided into two following main themes.

1). Pragmatic Transferability in Speech Act

Speech act is broadly approached to examine the language transfer in L1 to equivalent L2. There are many research conducts designed in interlanguage to the target language.

Takahashi (1996) studied on the problematic transferability by investigating Japanese EFL in Tokyo to examine about a Japanese request strategy that is more transferable when the L1 request strategy is perceived as more appropriate and its L2 equivalent is perceived in the same degree of contextual appropriateness. Besides, to study a Japanese request strategy is less transferable when the L1 request strategy is perceived as less appropriate. In addition, its L2 equivalent is perceived for conveying a different degree of contextual appropriateness. The findings found that the students' pragmatic competency was not similar to the native speakers'; moreover, the learners tended to use "Would you please" when encountering a L2 high-imposition situation. They were gentle enough to the various degrees of imposition in their transferability decisions.

The niche of this study found that the sample group is only male which might tend to invalidate the testing the imposition aspect. Moreover, Takahashi also pointed out that the effectiveness of formal instruction on IL pragmatic competency development should be further studied because of the instructional effects on the acquisition of morphosyntax which will be comprehensive for pragmatics.

Another situation on language proficiency so as to aid learners in bettering the pragmatic performances in EFL and to contribute knowledge on ILP behavior of the Algerian learners of English as a Foreign Language as Dendenne (2014) examined on transfer in interlanguage requests performed by Algerian EFL, to know the production of pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatic transfers presenting in EFL learners' production, and other features that characterize ILP of Algerian EFL learners. The results revealed that the Core Request, maintaining a higher level of directness using simple imperatives perhaps sound rude for NSs. Asking help from a stranger may be perceived as an invasion of the stranger's territory, signifying on rudeness. In pedagogy, teaching the speech act and request require concern about the teaching material, explicit instruction, and the effort on performing the speech. The pedagogical method suggested to enhance learners on understanding pragmatic comprehension is to spend more years of teaching is a better chance for teachers on acquiring knowledge.

Based on the situation of an awareness of cultural background of people in terms of socio-cultural context on communicating effectively and the investigation between native speakers and EFL learners' recognition of the speech act, Alemi and Khanlarzadeh (2016) indicated that in the pragmatic assessment of request speech act of Iranian EFL learners, the results showed that there are nine conditions as well as six request situations noted by raters in the pragmalinguistic and language socio-pragmatic components. Under these criteria of NNESRs, politeness, conversers' relationship, style and register, and explanation have an abundant significance.

Speech acts are also taught through various skills such as speaking, listening and writing. In writing, it is complicated for EFL learners to produce their speech acts suitably because of the diverse elements of writing to communicate with NSs. Devecia and Hmidaa (2017) stated that in the request speech act in emails done by Arab university students in the UAE, that the native English speakers and Arab learners of English were somewhat significant in discourse structure, strategy type, modified. Email teaching through the conventional context affected the competency of students' pragmatics in terms of academic feature.

Learners are enabled to transfer their native social and cultural rules into the target language, to achieve appropriate language behavior as Jiemin Bu (2012) examined the relationship between L1 Pragmatic and L2 Proficiency by focusing on understanding the social and cultural rules which constrain the target language and L1 pragmatic transfer on decreasing and increasing of L2 proficiency in forms of direct strategies, lexical and phrasal downgrades, imperatives and grounders. It is found that relationship found between L1 and pragmatic transfer and L2 proficiency of the other request strategies, internal modifiers and external modifiers are not clear. High proficiency L2 learners could have less occurrence of transferring their native language pragmatic customs, since they have not enough background knowledge of L2.

2) Pragmatic Development in Speech Act

Among the pragmatics acquisition, pragmatic development in EFL has been commonly focused on. Wijayanont et. al (2013) studied Pragmatic Development in a Foreign Setting by Indonesian learners of English: Evidence from Non Pedagogical Intervention by investigating pragmatic development in non-pedagogical intervention setting of Indonesian learners of English L2 pragmatic aspects versus independent implicit learning. This study focuses on investigating the development of direct and indirect strategies of complaint. It is indicated that the pattern of development was complicated for each individual. Indirect strategies were used in less than half of the participants' strategies. L2 pragmatics are able to develop in a foreign country setting, and the pedagogical interference should be done; otherwise the development is not able take place in all language learners.

Apart from speech act studies used in pragmatic transfer a get Language Culture Instruction and Pragmatic Comprehension Development in Malaysia to investigate the issue of the relationship between attitudes toward incorporating target language culture into classroom instruction and the development of pragmatic comprehension. It is revealed that positive attitude toward learning target language affects to a higher level of pragmatic comprehension. To aid of foreign language course books and the instruction of foreign language classroom instruction based on cultural information is suggested for further study.

Speech act production doesn't only concern the instruction that mainly occurs cognitive process. Nevertheless, there are few studies that proposed this assumption. Consequently, Eva Alcon Soler et. al (2010) explore the effect of instruction on learners' pragmatic awareness from speech acts of learners by focusing on refusals under the two hypotheses: learners' awareness of pragmalinguistics and

sociopragmatics. It is suggested that pedagogical instruction influences the distinguishing of learners' awareness of refusals.

As it can clearly be seen, pragmatic transfer in speech act reviewed above, the request strategy in form of indirect speech and core request are often used to transfer L1 to L2. However, studying on multimedia design should be added as further tools to learn ridiculous types of speech act which are from the learners' backgrounds. Moreover, the additional foreign language classroom instruction of the target language should be discussed through cultural knowledge. Teachers themselves are required to be more trained on pragmatics for learners' empowerment.

III. Pragmalinguistic Awareness

Pragmalinguistic awareness has broadly been found from the previous studies on pragmatic investigations. Takahashi (2005) examined pragmatic linguistic awareness to explore whether it is related to motivation or proficiency in the Japanese EFL learners' pragmalinguistics awareness of L2 implicit input process and the learners' awareness of the target features whether it is relevant to motivation and proficiency. Japanese EFL learners tend to emphasize on discourse markers and idiomatic expression rather than complicated request head act. For instructional settings, the colloquial English is less possible to do than the discourse markers. Students should be persuaded to be in the in-input environment of EFL classroom. Based on Takahashi (2012; 2013; 2014; 2015) initially tried to explore the effects of motivation and listening proficiency as variables of individual differences (ID) on pragmatic awareness and the complicated request form learning. She also examined the integrated grammatical development with obvious pragmatic competence supported by Kasper & Rose (2002), it was found there are two standard of studies prepared for interpreting relationship between grammar and pragmatics. Later on, Takahashi (2012) investigate the effect of the ID variables on learners' awareness by using bi-clausal request form, the listening proficiency variables are two of the four motivation subscales and the pragmatic awareness of the target forms.

In addition, Takahashi (2017) has conducted Pragmatics-Grammar Interface in Pragmalinguistic Awareness and Learning by investigating the possibility and degree of grammatical knowledge of Japanese EFL learners for the awareness of target bi-clausal request forms which is prepared in the implicit input and their learning of the complicated form. Learners who have enough grammar knowledge tend to notice the target forms in the input and use bi-clausal form in the posttest performance. For the various ID factors: motivation and listening proficiency can be brought to the in-depth analysis of form function mapping toward autonomous learning.

Pragmalinguistic awareness is related to the learner's motivation especially basic motivation, therefore, to increase the chances of pragmatic feature observation based on the implicit criteria, the learners' motivation should be motivated in various ways. Some studies of pragmatic awareness has failed to explore how grammar interacts with various other ID factors and how these factors are concerned in the form-function analysis of the input overall (Takahashi, 2017).

IV. Effect of Instruction on Learners' Pragmatic Awareness

Interlanguage pragmatics have been focused on the scope of language pedagogy, suggestion are produced for techniques and activities to develop learners' pragmatic awareness on speech acts. Speech acts are still used to approach EFL learners. There are various techniques used to raise learners' awareness, like TV series strategies, films to explore the refusal teaching at the discourse level are effective as information a and teaching at the discourse level is operative as learners' awareness of refusals (Soler & Pitarch, 2010).

As scholars' investigate the effects of instruction on learners there are two main advantages of pragmatic pedagogies on learners' attention and consciousness of pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic topics based on the refusal speech act. They are 1) the planning of teaching actions perhaps work on pragmatic instruction in the context of EFL should prepare learners for audio pragmatic input, and 2) being aware of various pragmatic meaning comprehension to work with pragmatic consciousness raising tasks. Another is an instruction refusal speech act at the level of discourse probably assist to help learners for learning speaking skills indirectly like turn-taking or negotiation methods; hence, instructors should not ignore bringing the speech acts through pragmatic instruction (Soler and Pitarch, 2010).

As pragmatic concepts mentioned above, there are different gaps and limitations on longitudinal and experimental studies, and the same number of participants should be controlled equally. Interviews of the learners should be of one method to test their attitudes towards pragmatic comprehension across L2 culture. Moreover, awareness of pragmatic grammatical knowledge is important for an experiment study based on learners' backgrounds should be concerned. The class project was investigated on pragmatic transfers of the first-year students of English major in Nakhon Phanom University in the first semester of academic year 2017, and found that students have encountered low L1 proficiency and lack of L2 socio-cultural background knowledge as well as grammatical knowledge. Thus, to fill the gap, the researcher is interested in enhancing EFL learners to acquire proper ways of transferring the L1 into L2 in the diverse situations appropriately.

Methodology

The study of The Investigation of Grammatical Instruction on Pragmatics of Thai EFL Learners: A Case of the 1st Year-English-major Students of Nakhon Phanom University aims to address the following two hypothesis.

- 1). The grammatical instruction affects the scores of Thai EFL learners.
- 2). There are various types of the request speech act produced by Thai EFL learners.

These lead to the two following research questions:

1. Does the grammatical instruction affect pragmatics of Thai EFL learners' scores?
2. What type of the request speech act influences pragmatics of Thai EFL learners?

Therefore, respond to the above two research questions, the study will focus on the class project based on the research methodology described below.

Participants

The participants in this study were the undergraduate students. They were from the two groups of the first year Thai EFL students studying in the English major of the first semester in the academic year 2017 at the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Nakhon Phanom University. These participants were 4 males and 27 females from 31 of 35 from the two classes, aging from 17-19 years old. The 4 students of 35 who participated in the first week of doing the pretest were finally cut out of the whole sample group due to their not showing up to be tested in the second week. All participants were classified by the purposive sampling which they have various English proficiency skills.

Instruments

The instruments used in this study were the pretest and the posttest of Discourse Completion Test (DCT) consisting of 10 items of Thai requesting situations and 10 items of English requesting situations. The 10 situations of the posttest were different from the pretest. The materials used after teaching comprised the 16 types of the request speech act adapted from Blum-Kalka et al, (1989) and Alcon, (2005), model verbs, grammatical comprehension tasks, Thai and English email writing tasks. There were two pragmatically equivalent versions of the DCT, one in English and the other one in Thai. Both pretest and posttest of English were edited by the American native instructor in order to make sure that these versions were reasonable situations and accurate structures. These ten situations were then given to students, divided based on the social class categorized in the table below.

Test	Social status			Total situations)
	Lower	Equal	Higher	
Pretest	2	4	4	10
Posttest	1	4	5	10

Figure 1: Size of Imposition

Frameworks

The unit of analysis requests in the discourse completion test questionnaire provided consists of speech act which is called requested semantic formulas among the utterances or sequences of utterances. From this study, the coding scheme of requested semantic formulas is mostly based on the coding scheme of request from CCSARP developed by Blum-Kulka et al, (1989) and Alco, (2005). The requested semantic formulas are divided into two categories: request strategies, internal modifiers and external modifiers as indicated below.

Modification Devices				
Type	Subtype		Example	
Request strategies	Want statement		-I want you to help me my homework.	
	Hedge performatives		- I would like to ask you to wash the dishes.	
Internal Modification	Openers		-Do you think you could open the window? -Would you mind opening the window?	
	Softeners	Understatement	-Could you open the window for a moment?	
		Downtoner	-Could you possibly open the window?	
		Hedge	-Could you kind of open the window?	
		Intensifiers	-You really must open the window.	
			-I'm sure you wouldn't mind opening the window?	
		Filters	Hesitators	-I er, erm, er- I wonder if you could open the window.
			Cajolers	-You know, you see, I mean
			Appealers	-OK?, Right?, yeah
			Attention-getter	-Excuse me...; Hello...;Look...; Tom...; Mr. Edwards...; father... ..
	External Modification	Preparator		May I ask you a favor...?...Could you open the window?
		Emphasis of Importance		Please clean it up. Don't forget.
		Grounders		It seems it's quite hot here... Could you open the window?
Disarmers			I hate botherin you, but could you open the window?	
Expanders			Would you mind opening the window? ...Once again, could you open the window?	
Promise of reward			Could you open the window?...if you open it, I promise to bring you to the cinema.	
Please			Would you mind opening the window, please?	

Figure 2: The Coding Scheme of Request Strategies of New Taxonomy adapted from Bulm-Kulka et al. (1989) and Alco, (2005)

Procedures

The study spent 4 weeks of conduct for the 31 first year English-major students. First, the posttest of 10 Thai and 10 English situations were administered to 31 students in the first week. The request speech act models were taught through the 16 taxonomy including the model verbs in the second week. Then in the third week and the fourth week, students were given the grammatical comprehension tasks, pragmatic Thai and English tasks, pragmatic email writing, random role-play and random interview, and finally the posttest in the same day.

Data collection

One group from two classes of the first year students was collected by purposive sampling. In this study, within one group of the research conduct, the researcher divided students into three groups so as to order the tasks used – to examine whether the material order instruction affected the scores of students. The materials order was designed as the diagrams below.

Group 1 = Pretest → teaching → Exercise 1a → Exercise 1b → Exercise 2 → Email writing → posttest

Group 2 = Pretest → teaching → Email writing → Exercise 2 → Exercise 1a → Exercise 1b → posttest

Group 3 = Pretest → teaching → Exercise 2 → Exercise 1a → Exercise 1b → Email writing → posttest

Data analysis

The data collected for this study were analyzed according to models of the request speech act. The two American-native speakers and Thai instructor are the inter-raters for giving the model pattern based on the scores of 0 and 1. 0 means students were able to produce pragmatics incorrectly based on grammatical context and speech act model, whereas 1 means students were able to produce pragmatics accurately or nearly accurately, based on the speech act model and grammatical context.

To check the frequency of the request speech act produced by learners, coding was done in order to group the category of speech act that occurred for the research conduct. Statistics of t-test and One-way Anova were brought to analyze data. The results of the study will be described in the results and discussions.

Results and Discussions

The study of the Investigation of Grammatical Instruction on Pragmatics of Thai EFL Learners: A Case of 1st Year English-Major Students of Nakhon Phanom University aims to two address research questions: Does the grammatical instruction affect pragmatics of Thai EFL learners' scores? and What type of the request speech act influences pragmatics of Thai EFL learners?

The DCT posttest used in this study consists of 10 situations of English ranging from the lower, equal and higher social status when the learners uttered with waiters, peers, strangers instructors, doctor, and mother. They were classified into 1 situation

involving lower social status, 4 situations involving equal status, and 5 situations involving higher status of the addressee. Therefore, to respond to RQ1: Does grammatical instruction affect pragmatics of Thai EFL learners' scores? in the Paired Samples Test, the results showed as below.

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Posttest	6.39	31	2.333	.419
	Pretest	3.16	31	1.846	.331

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Posttest - Pretest	3.226	2.232	.401	2.407	4.044	8.048	30	.000

Figure 3: The Paired Sample T-test

The results revealed that the posttest scores ($Mean = 6.39$, $SD = 2.33$) were significantly higher than the pretest scores ($Mean = 3.16$, $SD = 1.85$), indicated by $t(31) = 8.05$, $p < .05$, $d = 1.53$. That means, the grammatical instruction used in pragmatics was effective, and the teacher could effectively improve their learners' skills.

Effect size: Cohen's $d = 1.53536465$

Therefore, to reply to the first research question, it is stated that grammatical instruction affects scores of Thai EFL learners.

After the researcher tested the hypothesis that the grammatical instruction affects the scores of Thai EFL learners, it was found that learners improved their learning as the scores of between the pretest and the posttest according to the paired samples t-test. However, the scores of the pretest and the posttest could not identified that instruction affects the learners' score level; therefore, the researcher tested the hypothesis by using one-way anova in order to compare the teaching method through material order pedagogy. It indicated that the material order did not affect the posttest scores of learners. When looking at an individual material task used in between and within groups shown in one-way anova table below, it indicated that there were not significantly different. That means the material order did not affect the learners' posttest scores.

Oneway

[DataSet1] D:\UBRU\data P Koy.sav

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Ex.1a	Between Groups	28.774	2	14.387	2.085	.143
	Within Groups	193.162	28	6.899		
	Total	221.935	30			
Ex.1b	Between Groups	9.102	2	4.551	.475	.627
	Within Groups	268.317	28	9.583		
	Total	277.419	30			
Ex.2	Between Groups	.297	2	.148	.103	.903
	Within Groups	40.413	28	1.443		
	Total	40.710	30			
Email	Between Groups	9.209	2	4.604	2.472	.103
	Within Groups	52.146	28	1.862		
	Total	61.355	30			
Total	Between Groups	84.835	2	42.418	1.219	.311
	Within Groups	974.584	28	34.807		
	Total	1059.419	30			

ONEWAY Posttest BY Methods
/MISSING ANALYSIS.

Figure 4: Material Order

Thus, there were other factors involved in the influencing the learner acquisition such as lexical use, word recognition, sentence construction, etc. involved. These were brought to the second hypothesis that is there are other factors influencing learners on pragmatic acquisition. Hence, to find the answer of the second research question. RQ2: What type of the request speech act influences pragmatics of Thai EFL learners?

The results revealed that students were able to produce pragmatics of the request speech act differently. There were 327 frequencies used by students classified by 12 types. The three frequently used by Thai EFL learners are ATG (Attention-getter) accounting for 30.28 % (99 times), SOF (Softeners) accounting for 20.80 % (68 times), and IOI (Emphasis of Importance) accounting for 15.90 % (52 times) respectively. Whereas the three least frequently used by Thai EFL learners are INT (Intensifier) accounting for 0.91% (3 times), HST (Hesitators) accounting for 0.31% (1 time), and DAM (Disarmers) accounting for 0.31% (1 time) respectively.

Coding	Type	Frequency	Percent
1. ATG	Attention-getter	99	30.28
2. SOF	Softeners	68	20.80
3. EOI	Emphasis of Importance	52	15.90
4. HP	Hedged performance	32	9.79
5. PRP	Preparator	21	6.42
6. OPN	Openers	20	6.11
7. TIT	Time Intensifiers	14	4.28
8. MRL	Moralizing	11	3.36
9. POR	Promise of reward	5	1.52
10. INT	Intensifiers	3	0.91
11. HST	Hesitators	1	.31
12. DAM	Disarmers	1	.31
		327	100

Figure 5: Type of Frequency for Request Speech Act

For the conclusion of the study will be describe in the conclusion.

Conclusion

This study explored the Grammatical Instruction on Pragmatics of Thai EFL learners of 1st Year English-Major Students of Nakhon Phanom University by the two hypotheses: 1) The grammatical instruction affect pragmatics of Thai EFL learners' scores and 2) there are various types of the request speech act influences pragmatics of Thai EFL learners.

The findings of the study showed that Thai EFL learners obtained the higher scores after learning through the grammatical instruction on pragmatics. There are 12 types of speech acts frequently used by learners: Attention-Getter, Softeners, Emphasis of Importance, Hedged Performance, Preparator, Openers, Time Intensifiers, Moralizing, Promise of Rewards, Intensifier, Hesitators, and Disarmers.

Limitations

Some week during the conduct, the researcher could not find sufficient time to meet participants as often as the researcher needed. Instead, the researcher had to find the leisure time after their normal classes to conduct the study. Consequently, the participants did not more concentration to participate this study. The learners did the Thai pragmatic version before the English ones given; thus, some looked at what they had written in Thai before then they did the English version. This perhaps caused them to recognize their L1 context to transfer L2 for the ones. In addition, the four-week research period as not adequate to enhance pragmatic acquisition among EFL learners because they could not recognize all patterns of the request speech act as well as grammatical structure acquisition. More importantly, in terms of size of imposition and social status, the comparable situations between the pretest and the posttest must be the same amount so as to make the study more reliable, valid and accurate.

Recommendations

Before doing the posttest, students were randomized to make the role-play after they finished pragmatic acquisition, and about 80 % of them randomized could do orally well. The sentences which students always used while producing pragmatics were: could you please....?, would you like...?, would you mind....?, would you please....?, May I...?, Excuse me, where theis, and please give me..., and would like...

For interviews, students need approximately four months to comprehend pragmatic acquisition, instead of only one month. They could perceive that the request speech act is essential to their daily life when they dealt with the diverse persons in different situations. They were able to pick up the polite request in every day conversation. They gained more ways and be more confident to ask the native speakers more. They need to learn individual pragmatics with instructors, particularly with native speakers. They also obtained more vocabularies, idioms, grammar for pragmatics. For the email pragmatic learning 2-3 sessions of learning will be good for students to comprehend the contents very well. To be more effective on pragmatic acquisition, students are required to learn through the real environments, like going out-door, and

via various materials such as Youtube videos, movies, unreal situations, and socio-cultural pragmatics in the longitudinal study.

Implications

Pragmatic acquisition of the request speech act is an implication for pedagogy. It should be added as one of the topics in the listening and speaking courses and integrated with other courses in the English curriculum in the future. For further study, the researcher will extend the scope of study pragmatics by comparing the international students among EFL learners: Thais, Laotians, and Vietnamese based on the Quasi Experimental research which will be conducted in the research. The next time the research is conducted, the study will classify the samples and the teaching strategies more effectively in order to accomplish students' pragmatic acquisition more efficiently.

Acknowledgements

This study would not be successful without a very kindness of my lecturer, Asst. Prof. Dr. Angkana Thongpoon Phattanasorn, currently works as the chair of Apply Linguistic Program at Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Khon Kaen University who suggested and commented before and after the research conduct. Besides, I would like to thanks Ms. Wittika Thangchan, a lecturer of Department of Hospitality and Event Management, Faculty of Business Administration and Accountancy, Khon Kaen University for data analysis suggestion. Lastly, I would like to thanks Mr. Lloyd Wagner, a US proof reader for this research article.

References

- Abrams, Z. (2013). Say What?! L2 Sociopragmatic Competence in CMC: Skill Transfer and Development. *CALICO Journal*, 30(3), 423-445.
- Alcon, E. (2007). *Fostering EFL learners' awareness of requesting through explicit and implicit consciousness-raising task*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Alemin, M. and Khanalarzadeh, N. (2016). Pragmatic assessment of request speech act of Iranian EFL learners by non-native English speaking teachers. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research* 4(2), (July, 2016) 19-34 19
- Baba, J. (2010). Interlanguage pragmatics study of indirect complaint among Japanese ESL learners. *December 2010, Volume 7, No.12 (Serial No.84)*.
- Blum-Kulka, S. and Elieo, (1989). *Requests and Apologies: A Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP)1*. p.207.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bu, J. (2012). A study of Relationship between L1 Pragmatic and L2 Proficiency. *Journal of English Language Teaching, Vol. 5 no. 5*.
- Butler, C. S. (1988). *Politeness and the semantics of modalised directives in English*. In D. Benson, M. J. Cummings, & W. S. Greaves (Eds.), *Linguistics in a systematic perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Harling, B. (2001). *Evaluating the empirical evidence: Ground for instruction in pragmatics?* In K.R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dendenne, B. (2014). Could you help me with these bag brother? My shoulders are falling." Transfer in interlanguage requests performed by Algerian EFL learners. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, Vol. 10(2), 29-47*.
- Devecia, T. and Hmidaa, B. I. (2017). The request speech act in emails by Arab university students in the UAE. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 13(1), 194-214; 2017*
- Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatics Transfer, *Second Language Research* 8:3, 203-231.
- Kasper, G. (1998). On Pragmatic Transfer. *Studies in English Language and Linguistics*. 0:5-20.
- Kasper, G. (2000). *Four perspectives on L2 development*. Annual Conference of the American Association of Applied Linguistics, Vancouver, March. 2000.

- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). Introduction to Second Language Pragmatic Development. *Language Learning*, 52(s1), 1-11.
- Patricia, B. F. (1998). On Pragmatic Transfer. *Studies in English Language and Linguistics*.
- Takahashi, (2012). Investigate the effect of the ID variables on learners' awareness of bi-p. 5-20.clausal.
- Takahashi, (2005). Pragmatic linguistics Awareness: Is it Related to Motivation an Proficiency? in order to explore Japanese EFL learners' request form. *Applied Linguistics*. 26/1: 90-120.
- Takahashi, (1996). *Pragmatic Transferability*. Cambridge University Press.
- Takahashi, (2017). Pragmatic-Grammar Interface in Pragmalinguistic Awareness and Learning. *Language, Culture and Communication*. Vol 9. 2017.
- Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure, *Applied Linguistics* 4:2, 91-112.
- Trosborg, A. (2010). *Pragmatics across Languages and Cultures*. Handbook Online.
- Soler, A. E. and Pitarch, G. J. (2010). The Effect of Instruction on Learners' Pragmatic Awareness: a Focus on Refusals. *International Journal of English Studies*. *IJES* 10(1).2010, pp. 65-80.
- Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, (2007). *Speech Acts*. First published Tue Jul 3, 2007; substantive revision Thu Oct 2, 2014. Retrieved on May 28, 2018. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/speech-acts/>
- Wijayanont, A. and Laila, M. (2013). *Development in a Foreign Setting by Indonesian Learners of English: Evidence from Pragmatic m Non Pedagogical Intervention*.
- The 1st Colalite: Conference on Language, Linguistics and Literature, Jendral Soediraman University, Purwokerto-Indonesia, 9 November 2013.
- Contact email:** arnunnit@gmail.com