

THE EFFECT OF INTEGRATING PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURES IN GRAMMAR TEACHING ON INDONESIAN UNIVERSITY EFL LEARNERS

¹Sutisno Adam, ^{1*}Sartika Sailuddin

¹English Literature Lecturer, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Khairun, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author Email: ssailuddin@unkhair.ac.id

Article Info	Abstract
Article History Received: August 2024 Revised: October 2024 Published: January 2025	<i>One of the challenges that language teachers face is developing the language competence of Foreign Language learners so that they can use language correctly and appropriately in a variety of social contexts. This study aims to observe whether there is an effect of pragmatic instruction in EFL classroom to learners' grammatical and pragmatic competence. The data collected were from year 2 English students by using grammatical and pragmatic pre-tests and post-test for students to answer. Students were divided into two groups of the treatment group which receive pragmatic instructions of implied meanings and the control group which received regular teaching. Students' answers in the tests were analysed quantitatively to obtain the mean score and further will be compared. The results show that: 1) students perform low on both aspects in both pretest and posttest ($m1.1=3.63$, $m1.2=4.83$, $m2.1=4.27$, and $m2.2=3.47$), 2) there is a moderate positive effect of pragmatic instruction on students' grammatical competence ($t(60)=-3.73$, $p=0.000$), and 3) there's no effect of pragmatic instruction on students' pragmatic competence ($t(65)=1.73$, $p=0.089$). This finding indicates the role that explicit pragmatic instruction may play in boosting EFL learners' grammatical development, along with the extensive grammar learning that learners received. It suggests the need EFL curricula revision through incorporating pragmatic features in grammatical subjects. In this way, grammar learning can be improved, and pragmatic teaching model can also be created.</i>
Keywords Pragmatic competence; Grammatical competence; Conversational implicatures; Teaching grammar;	
How to cite: Adam, S., & Sailuddin, S. P. (2025). The Effect of Integrating Pragmatic Features of Conversational Implicatures in Grammar Teaching on Indonesian University EFL Learners, <i>JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching</i> , 13(1), 494-504. DOI: https://doi.org/10.33394/joltt.v13i1.12737	

INTRODUCTION

Pragmatics examines how language is used in social, cultural, and cognitive contexts, and how people produce and understand meaning through language. Often, pragmatics is studied in terms of communicative acts or sequences of speech acts (i.e. apologizing, saying thank you, making a request, saying goodbye, and so on). Of particular interest to language educators are findings highlighting the importance of teaching pragmatics to L2 learners (e.g., Rose 2012). Although some pragmatic knowledge has been shown to be universal and transferred from the first language - such as the knowledge that one should greet someone when meeting or say goodbye when leaving - more often than not, research has shown that teaching facilitates L2 learners. the ability to perform speech acts (Rose, 2012) and that learning interventions are more beneficial than no teaching of pragmatics (Rose, 2012).

It is understood that teaching facilitates the development of L2 pragmatic competence. Studies on second language teaching have mainly focused on explicit pragmatics teaching (i.e., providing direct instruction about how certain forms are used in context to achieve pragmatic goals) and implicit pragmatics teaching (i.e., exposing learners to the pragmatic aspects of the language and providing those with pragmatic aspects). a means of making

generalizations and conclusions about how language is used in context. In general, research has shown that students benefit from both explicit and implicit instruction, with more benefits cited for explicit instruction.

Pragmatic competence in a second/foreign language refers to the ability to use the structural repertoire of the target language (grammar, lexis, prosody, etc.) in a contextually and situationally appropriate way to understand the L2 in context and to achieve one's communicative goals. On the one hand, this competency requires pragmalinguistic skills, namely mastery of the linguistic forms offered by L2 to realize certain purposes; and on the other hand, sociopragmatic skills, namely knowledge about when to use which linguistic forms are appropriate in social situations (Glaser, 2018).

The importance of targeting pragmatic competence in language teaching is further underscored by research on the relationship between the development of pragmatics and the development of grammar and vocabulary skills. Most research confirms that pragmatic competence does not automatically develop along with lexical-grammatical proficiency, and that even highly proficient learners produce inappropriate pragmatic responses unless taught explicitly (e.g., Martí-Arnándiz 2008). Glaser (2014) reported on advanced learners who, despite having followed EFL instruction for over a decade, had never been explicitly taught about the pragmatic aspects of appropriate language use and thus used a set of non-target-like pragmatic patterns despite having lexical proficiency -high grammar. In Pfingsthorn and Flöck's (2017) study, pre-service secondary school EFL teachers, despite being overall advanced L2 users, were found to exhibit great difficulty in successfully identifying pragmatic violations.

It becomes necessary to provide sufficient input that students can utilize to accompany their linguistic knowledge since high proficiency learners have shown varied outcomes on their pragmatic competence. Rajabia, Azizifara, and Gowhary (2015) investigated the difference between high proficiency and low proficiency students' abilities to make requests. In their findings, high proficiency learners had more competence compared to the low group of students. Similarly, AlShraah, Harun, and Kariem (2023) found similar results on their assessment of learners' ability to employ politeness strategy. However, a contrasting finding has previously been reported in Youn (2014) where learners' proficiency did not guarantee corresponding pragmatic competence. Instead, it was revealed that learners' pragmatic competence is more dependent on their grammatical performance based on their ability to produce more complex sentences. Kentmen, Debreli, and Yavuz (2023) also reported inadequate achievement by high proficiency students in answering discourse-completion test (DCT) questions. Additionally, learners appeared to be more proficient in the comprehension level of implied meanings than the production of speech acts.

The importance of teaching pragmatics for language development has long been asserted. Tulgar (2016) stated that pragmatic instruction is essential to be integrated with other foreign language activities due to its role in raising learners' awareness of how to use the language appropriately. This argument is later extended by the fact that EFL learners have limited chance of learning and practicing the target language outside of the classroom; thus, making them rely on formal learning.

It is a common observation that language teachers often tend to fall short in terms of metapragmatic awareness and pragmatic knowledge. Given the important function of textbooks in providing pragmatic input, it is surprising that there is still so much to investigate in this area as attempts to explore this issue are relatively rare. Toprak and Aksoyalp (2015) investigated 17 English course books with different language proficiency levels prepared by leading international publishers. The findings of this research indicate that the three speech acts in question – complaint, apology, and suggestion – are present in the textbooks analyzed, although their realization and linguistic complexity vary. In other words, the range and

frequency of speech act strategies increases as the level of textbook proficiency increases. For example, explicit complaints are realized in more complex and linguistically detailed ways in advanced textbooks, while the same strategies are realized through simple utterances at the elementary level. Although the speech acts in question are found at all levels of textbooks with varying complexity and frequency, the findings of this research indicate that speech acts receive limited attention when compared with other language components such as grammatical units, phonology, spelling, etc.

To enhance EFL students' pragmatic development, several studies have implemented different learning methods. Li and Taguchi (2014) studied study abroad Chinese students who enrolled in programs focusing on grammar and vocabulary features with no target pragmatic aspects taught. The participants were then assigned in different groups with two pragmatic instructions being given: input-based practice and output-based practice. The group demonstrating the strongest effect is the input group as the students perform higher in recognition accuracy which was then explained as by the of opportunities for practicing pragmalinguistic forms, such as the grammar judgment task, and the dialogue reading task. Form-focused instruction implemented in Bataineh, Al-Qeyam, and Smadi's (2017) study has taken another point of view on teaching pragmatics. Although this approach heavily concerned with grammatical structures, the post-tests results suggested that students were positively affected both in their linguistic and pragmatic knowledge.

Zeff (2016) has outlined how to teach speech acts in EFL classes. In his study of greetings among Japanese students, he concluded that teaching and assessing greetings and other speech acts is unique because the only way to know whether a student acquires them is to see them use them in an unplanned and unprepared context. When it comes to greetings, a practical way to prepare students for what happens outside the classroom environment is through explicit pragmatic teaching. Such teaching should be a routine part of language learning classes regardless of mother tongue and target language. Simply put, the stakes are high when a greeting can make a lasting impression. Students who receive explicit instruction through the awareness-raising tasks described in Zeff's research develop an increased ability to participate appropriately and increase their chances of successful communication. The comparison between implicit and explicit instruction in pragmatic learning has also shown similar finding in Ziashahabi, Jabbari, and Razmi (2020)'s experimental study among Iranian EFL learners. In this study, explicit group outperformed implicit group based on their test results in identifying conversational implicatures. Finally, Nguyen, Pham, and Pham (2017) claimed a potential for input enhancement in teaching different aspects of pragmatics, including appropriacy, accuracy, external modifiers, and internal modifiers in the case of making criticism. It is evident that learners were able to notice target forms especially on meaning and to provide responses in it. Therefore, a meaning-focused context where learners can clearly observe the target features can induce understanding on language forms and their communicative functions. Benadel and Beghdadi (2021) has found that pragmatic holds a significant dimension in learners' grammatical achievement and suggested grammar courses to integrate pragmatic insights in classroom.

Based on what has been discovered in the field of pragmatic learning in EFL context, recommendations for classroom practice are made. According to Abdulrahman and Abu-Ayyash (2019), to tackle both receptive and productive skills, teaching only grammatical knowledge is not sufficient. Socializing students with routine practices or other forms with more interactional values should also be added. Involving pragmatic lessons has potential to provide more context-based materials and most importantly to achieve communicative goals effectively (Sickinger & Schneider, 2014). Among other target pragmatic features, conversational implicatures or implied meanings has higher rate of success and has served as

the most fundamental principle to introduce learners with meaning understanding (Blome-Tillmann, 2013).

Despite such important role that pragmatic instruction plays in EFL learning, little studies have gone further on experimentation of implemementing specific pragmatic features in EFL classrooms especially how it affects learners' grammatical development. In terms of language development among foreign learners, pragmatic intervention has evidently brought positive impacts. Alkawaz, Afrouz, Ansari, and Dabaghi (2023) have discovered that through incorporating explicit metapragmatic instruction, learners' speech acts production improves. In a self-learning situation also, pragmatic instruction can assist EFL learners in producing correct forms of request with varied modifiers (Civelek & Karatepe, 2021). Similarly, choosing request modifiers, Chen, Ye, He, and Yao (2020) have found positive attitudes among EFL learners toward the inclusion of pragmatic knowledge in teaching approach.

Until recently, pragmatics lessons are often missing from textbooks, so that the burden of teaching pragmatics is mostly borne by each teacher. Even its existence in EFL textbooks has been argued to have over-inclusion of negative politeness strategies, with limited exposure to other pragmatic aspects (Bataineh, Salman, Alroumi, AlJawarneh, Shkour, Okour, & Al-Jamal, 2023). With this in mind, another way to include pragmatic instruction in lessons is by showing how certain forms, such as conditionals, can be used to perform communicative actions, such as requests or suggestions. Adding pragmatics teaching in this way – by showing how native speakers use particular forms to achieve particular conversational goals – allows us to enhance lessons that are already part of our curriculum without adding new units to a syllabus that may be highly structured at a higher education institution.

Although pragmatic instruction has been heavily studied, little has gone further on investigating how it affects other facets in language learning. In our previous research, we found a correlation between pragmatic competence and grammatical competence (Adam & Sailuddin, 2023). This finding is striking, especially in the initial stage, where students achieved the same low level of pragmatic competence and grammatical competence even though they had received grammar lessons for four semesters, but no pragmatic lessons were given. With such realization, this study aims to fill the gap on exploring the potential of pragmatic instruction in enhancing EFL learners' grammatical development. It will be implemented through communicative approach by incorporating pragmatic instruction in grammar learning. At the end of the lesson, it is hoped that there will be an increase in students' grammatical competence and pragmatic awareness. Two research questions are posed in this study: To what extent can pragmatics instruction in grammar learning affect learners' grammatical competence? And to what extent can pragmatics instruction in grammar learning affect learners' pragmatic competence?

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This research uses a true experimental design that relies on statistical analysis to prove or disprove a hypothesis. This design was chosen because it is one of the most accurate forms of research because it provides specific scientific evidence. Furthermore, of all types of experimental designs, only true experimental designs can establish cause-and-effect relationships within a group. A true experimental design is ideal for investigating cause-and-effect relationships because it combines random assignment, manipulation of the independent variable, and control over extraneous factors. These features allow researchers to draw stronger conclusions about causality than other experimental or observational designs. In this design, challenges such as isolation the effect of pragmatic instruction as the only factor in learners' language development and how the instruction is sufficient to represent the

pragmatic features are inevitable. Further elaboration on how to anticipate these strains are explained below.

Research Participants

From a total of 80 students, 60 EFL students who were studying English literature at university were selected. The student has passed 3 grammar courses (beginner, basic and intermediate level) and will take the final grammar course (advanced level). All students come from the same Eastern of region of Indonesia and overall same level of English proficiency (intermediate) based on their length of English learning (6 years in school, and 1.5 year in university). Participants are divided into two classes (class A and class B), namely class A as the control group (which did not receive pragmatic learning treatment) and class B as the experimental group (which received pragmatic learning treatment). The sampling method used was random sampling where students taken from both classes had same, generalizable levels of proficiency so that there was no influence from these factors.

There are three variables identified in this research. The independent variable is the treatment of pragmatics teaching, the dependent variable is the students' grammar and pragmatics competence, and the control variable is the students' overall level of English proficiency.

Research Instruments

This study developed two modes of data collection: tests and teaching materials. The tests were conducted twice: one before learning experiment (pretest) and the next after learning experiment (posttest). Each of the tests consisted of two parts, namely grammar section to examine learners' competence on forms and pragmatics section to assess ability to recognize meaning. All questions are in the form of 10 multiple choices for each section and had been customized to match the learning topics which will be explained below. The test materials development process begins with identifying the two targeted constructs (i.e. grammar and pragmatic competence). Multiple choice is selected to minimize the time constraints and ensure the accuracy of scoring. The tests are designed by researchers and then reviewed by other lecturers who have experienced teaching grammar and pragmatics. This review process is aimed to identify if the questions have properly measured the content and ensuring the clarity. One major limitation is because it is time-bound with the teaching period of the targeted grammar lessons (adverbial clauses), there was no pilot test implemented. However, the tests are designed in the simplest forms to avoid ambiguity and higher difficulty level.

For the learning process, the grammar teaching materials followed the semester lesson plan format of a grammar subject. The topic selected for the treatment of this study is Adverbial Clauses with four sub-topics: time, contrast, purpose, and condition. As for the pragmatics construct being taught and tested in this study is implied meaning or known as conversational implicature. This basic construct is selected as it is considered as the fundamental principle in understanding meaning (Laughlin, Wain, & Schmidgall, 2015). This instructional content is also suitable for this practice as researchers avoid too difficult lessons that will surpass learners' proficiency. Additional learning materials were employed in the form of adverbial clauses examples completed with the implied meanings which were developed by both researchers taken from pragmatic textbooks and reformulated to match learners' comprehension level.

Data Collection Technique

In this study, pre-test and post-test were used to collect primary data. Since all the questions are in multiple-choice forms, the scoring is easier with the answer keys provided and to avoid subjective grading. The test duration is limited to 60 minutes for both groups and

conducted on the same soundproof rooms at the same hours (different days) to ensure that the procedures are not affected by environmental issues that might influence learners' focus. Both the experimental group and the control group were tested first to diagnose their initial knowledge of grammar and pragmatics. After introducing pragmatics to the prospective treatment group, they received a post-test to measure the extent to which teaching pragmatics influenced their grammatical knowledge as well as their pragmatics competence.

The teaching period lasted for four weeks with a 90-minutes session every week. The experimental group received extensive pragmatics instruction. In other words, the teacher made them aware of pragmatics, especially how extra-linguistic factors influence the creation and interpretation of grammatical formulas, namely implied meaning. The teaching method selected is enhanced input whereas after the grammatical aspect of adverbial clauses is explained, the teacher highlighted the implied meanings in each sentence of the samples which used adverbial clauses formula.

In contrast, control group members did not engage in the same pragmatic input. These participants have regular class time: 90 minutes to learn the rules of traditional tense grammar by focusing on the morphological structure and the situations in which forms can be used syntactically

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were calculated for the pretest and posttest scores of both the groups. A dependent sample t-test was employed to investigate the effect of the proposed intervention on students' grammar learning. This t-test focused on both the changes in the students' grammar scores for the experimental and the control groups, and the difference between the students' pretest and posttest scores in the experimental and the control conditions. Prior to the t-test, Levene's test is employed to assess the homogeneity of the variances ($p < .05$). Results of the t-test with significant differences are further computed to find out the effect size by using Cohen's d method (Boos, Duan, & Liu, 2023). Cohen's d is appropriate for paired samples and it is not influenced by the sample size, allowing researchers to focus on the actual magnitude of the effect rather than the likelihood of observing it by chance.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

Learners' Grammatical and Pragmatic Competence

Descriptive statistics are presented below to grasp an overview of the relationship between each section with students' overall achievement (mean score). The students' overall score could be translated as their level of proficiency in each aspect. The comparison between students' score on grammatical and pragmatic sections would link to the observation of which competence that students could master more with the different exposures and instructions given. The result of the analysis is shown in the table below:

Table 1
Paired Samples Statistics

Learning Area	Control Group		Experimental Group	
	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Grammar	4	4	3.2	5.7
Pragmatic	5.4	3.2	3.1	3.6

Table 1 showed that in control group, there is no difference of students' test scores between pre-test and post-test in the grammatical section. Surprisingly in the pragmatic section, there is a decrease of 2.2 points. In the experimental group, there are raises in both learning areas. The mean score in grammar section increases by 3.5 points and followed by pragmatic section with 0.5 points. Overall, students performed poorly as they could not

achieve even half of the total score (10). Although the statistical result shows a very minimum gap between pre-test and post-test, but inferential procedure of paired-samples t-test is needed to see the significance level and the t-value. Therefore, further investigation on how significant this difference is explored through dependent t-test.

Hypotheses Testing: Difference between Control and Experimental Group

Quantitative analysis of paired-samples t-test is continued to prove whether pragmatic instruction could contribute to both grammatical and pragmatic competence.

Table 2
Paired Samples T-Test Results

Control Group						
Learning Area	Mean		t-value	p-value	Decision (Null Hypothesis)	Interpretation
	Pre-Test	Post-Test				
Grammar	4	4	0.165	0.87	Accepted	Not significant
Pragmatic	5.4	3.2	3.2	0.00	Rejected	Significant
Experimental Group						
Learning Area	Mean		t-value	p-value	Decision (Null Hypothesis)	Interpretation
	Pre-Test	Post-Test				
Grammar	3.2	5.7	6.15	0.00	Rejected	Significant
Pragmatic	3.1	3.6	-0.81	0.42	Accepted	Not significant

Cohen's d Effect size $r = -0.63$

In the control group, the result is statistically significant ($p = .001$) only for the pragmatic section with $t = 3.2$, showing that regular grammar teaching may have medium effect on students' pragmatics' competence. From this initial analysis, it can be deduced that H_0 is rejected for pragmatic competence, and it is accepted in grammar where there is no effect of regular teaching method to this learning area.

Although there are differences of mean scores on both grammar and pragmatic sections in the experimental group, only the grammar area is categorized as significant ($p = .001$) while pragmatic area accepts the null hypothesis. The increase is as high as 78% from 3.2 to 5.7. This finding indicates that the pragmatic instruction given during grammar teaching results in an improvement of grammar scores ($t(30) = 6.15$, $p < 0.001$). As the result is significant, the analysis is continued to calculate the effect size by using Cohen's d measure. This calculation is aimed to answer whether pragmatic instruction influences grammatical competence. The effect size found is $r = -0.63$ which indicates medium effect. Thus, pragmatic instruction does affect students' grammatical learning moderately.

Discussion

Grammatical knowledge and pragmatic knowledge have been studied for their correlation and how they influence each other on one's language development (Adam & Sailuddin, 2023). In the context of EFL learners, both skills are crucial as the goal of language learning is not only on mechanical proficiencies but also on students' ability to develop communicative competence. Communicative competence encompasses learners' ability to utilize their language capital (vocabulary, grammar) for daily communication in accordance with the context (pragmatic aspects). This approach is strategic to allow learners in acquiring both linguistic forms as well as the appropriateness according to the social settings (Glaser, 2018)

This study responds to the identification of problem in Abdulrahman and Abu-Ayyash's (2019) study which states that to enhance both receptive and productive skills, relying on grammatical learning area would not be sufficient for language development. In this study, grammar subject has been manipulated by integrating pragmatic instructions specifically on eliciting implied meanings of sentences by using certain forms. As learners in this study have been explicitly taught with the target forms, i.e. adverbial clauses, additional exposure was given by extending the lecture on samples of adverbial clauses which contain implied meanings. This input was aimed to familiarize students with routine practices that often come at interactions. This goal is in line with the potential of conversational implicatures, among other pragmatic features, to have a higher rate of success and set the basic understanding of pragmatics (Blome-Tilman, 2013; Sickinger & Schneider, 2014). The very basic selection of pragmatics features is appropriate for learners in this study context as it can facilitate learners to perceive the extended input as an assistance and not making the grammar learning become more complicated.

The first finding sought in this study was how, overall, students in both groups performed poorly on grammar and pragmatic learning areas. Such low achievement may be analyzed separately. In terms of grammatical development, even on the previous studies, despite the intensive, lengthy courses given to teach grammar, students still achieve poor to moderate level of proficiency (Adam & Sailuddin, 2023). As this study focuses on intervening one possible factor which is teaching method, it will look at the effect of the expanded lessons which cover implied meanings to give students a picture of real context of when to use the forms. Students' pragmatic competence, similarly, appears to be low on both groups in the two times being assessed. This result may come from students' unfamiliarity with implicatures which have never been instructed in any of their classes since students will learn Pragmatics course at least when they are in their third year of study. The decrease in the control group will be treated as an effect of distraction as students may find it distracting to their grammar learning as they are suddenly tested pragmatics without any instruction given before.

To compare the effects of treatment to the two learning areas, significant changes are only observed on students' grammatical development. The increase of students' scores on grammar is in line with Li and Taguchi's (2014) findings where students performed better in their tasks after being exposed with pragmatic instructions especially the input-based practice. Consistently, Bataineh, Al-Qeyam, and Smadi's (2017) also reported that students were able to improve their linguistic and pragmatic knowledge through the combination of grammar and pragmatic features being taught. The results of these experiments are confirming the argument that pragmatic instruction is necessary to be incorporated with other activities in a foreign language learning class as it plays major role on shaping learners' awareness in using the language (Tulgar, 2016). These similar outcomes may derive from the directness of the instruction and how learners are made aware of the intervention being made.

Enhancing input in teaching different language aspects can also be a factor which makes learners in this study achieve a better understanding of language forms. Highlighting implied meanings of different expressions given could raise learners' thinking process to internalize the target forms and how they can be used in communication. Nguyen, Pham, and Pham (2017) have explained that pragmatic features can support learners in not only noticing, but also to provide responses towards target forms. Additionally, explicit instruction of conversational implicatures has before been identified to be more effective compared to implicit instruction (Ziashahabi, Jabbari, & Razmi, 2020). This can be the main rationale of how pragmatic can affect learners' grammar development. Therefore, explicit pragmatic instruction being delivered throughout this experiment has been evident to mediate learners' grammar learning.

Pragmatic development appears to be more complex and cannot sufficiently be accommodated in a grammar class, despite being explicitly directed. This result is contrasting with AlShraah, Harun, and Kariem (2023) and Rajabia, Azizifara, and Gowhary's (2015) studies as they stated that the more proficient the learners, the higher their pragmatic competencies. Instead, learners' pragmatic development seems to be independent with their grammatical performance (Youn, 2014; and Kentmen, Debreli, & Yavuz, 2023). This phenomenon may be explained by the fact that advanced learners may still face difficulties in recognizing correct pragmatic features (Pfingsthorn & Flöck, 2017). In addition to that, Zeff (2016) has also asserted that pragmatic learning should happen routinely in an extensive period.

Although findings in this study have portrayed a clear picture on how pragmatic instruction can enhance grammar learning, it should be noted that EFL learners involved are in a smaller scope of participants. Also, cultural influences can also factor in within the process improving learners' pragmatic awareness. Limited exposure to native speakers and authentic pragmatic learning materials also may hinder the success of improving learners' pragmatic knowledge in this context. Hence, this study should be the reinforcement of ripening pragmatic learning in varied EFL contexts.

CONCLUSION

The biggest conclusion of this study is how grammatical and pragmatic competence are not separated on learners' language development. This model fits the recent language development phenomenon among EFL learners where input could come from various sources and not only classroom teachings. Therefore, language competence and pragmatic competence or could also be called learners' competence and performance might develop together. One competence could influence the other, which indicates a clear correlation between them as has been highlighted in previous studies in this field.

To sum up, English learners require enhanced instructions in their grammar learning, which in one way can be done by integrating pragmatic teachings. The features of implied meaning can set the basic introduction to learners on how language forms can be used to convey different directness of ideas. Although explicit instruction of implicatures cannot improve learners' pragmatic competence at certain level, it can still provide foundation for language use according to the conversational context; thus, facilitating learners' understanding towards abstract forms of the language.

Future grammar learning practices should take account of other language aspects that can be incorporated into the learning materials. Pragmatic aspects can be one choice as it allows contextual portrayal of how language forms are used in conversations. Another important implication is that the need of a set learning routines that can be implemented in an EFL curriculum which will in turn fill the gap of well-fitted pragmatic teaching models. Grammar subjects can be the starting point of integrating pragmatic instruction as the provision of contextual practices in curricula. This step may become the trigger for other English subjects especially in EFL contexts to start incorporating contextual practices by using pragmatic subjects.

The current study has shed light on the potential of pragmatic features to be integrated in grammatical learning; hence, future studies in the EFL learning field can also put into practice this method by trying on other features which may be more significant both in learners' grammatical and pragmatic development. Longitudinal studies which observe more lasting impacts of pragmatic instruction across different language facets will also enrich the literature on pragmatic effects. As this study focuses on conversational implicatures, future studies can also incorporate different pragmatic features which will foster continued exploration of the potential of pragmatic instructions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research is funded by the PKUPT Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Khairun, year 2024.

REFERENCES

- Abdulrahman, N. C., & Ayyash, E. A. S. A. (2019). Linguistic competence, communicative competence, and interactional competence. *Journal of Advances in Linguistics*, 10(1), 1600-1616.
- Adam, S., & Sailuddin, S. P. (2023). Correlation between Grammatical and Pragmatic Competences among Indonesian University EFL Learners. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 6(3), 612-620. <https://doi.org/10.34050/elsjish.v6i3.30764>
- Alkawaz, A., Afrouz, M., Nejadansari, D., & Dabaghi, A. (2023). The effect of explicit pragmatic instruction on EFL students' production of speech acts: pragmalinguistic vs. Sociopragmatic errors in focus. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 15(31), 1-17.
- Alshraah, S. M., Harun, H., & Kariem, A. I. A. (2023). Pragmalinguistic competence of directness request level: A case of Saudi EFL learners. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 11(3), 56-71.
- Bataineh, R.F., Al-Qeyam, F., & Smadi, O. (2017). Does form-focused instruction really make a difference? Potential effectiveness in Jordanian EFL learners' linguistic and pragmatic knowledge acquisition. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 2(17), 1-11.
- Bataineh, R. F., Salman, F. A., ALRoumi, H. J., Al Jawarneh, R. S. B., Shkour, A. G., Okour, S. A., & Al-Jamal, D. A. (2023). Negative Politeness Strategies in Jordanian EFL Textbook Dialogs. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies*, 10(5), 136-146.
- Benadel, I., & Beghdadi, A. (2021). The Impact of Integrating Pragmatics Instruction in Grammar Teaching on EFL learners' Use of Tenses. *Revue Dirassat*, 12(1), 3-24.
- Blome-Tillmann, M. (2013). Conversational implicatures (and how to spot them). *Philosophy Compass*, 8(2), 170-185.
- Boos, D. D., Duan, K., & Liu, X. (2023). Pairwise comparisons for Levene-style variability parameters. *Communications in Statistics-Simulation and Computation*, 52(4), 1562-1576.
- Chen, M. H., Ye, S. X., He, J., & Yao, D. D. (2022). The Effect of Pragmatic Instruction on Developing Learners' Use of Request Modifiers in the EFL Context. *World Journal of English Language*, 12(8).
- Civelek, M., & Karatepe, Ç. (2021). The impact of student-paced pragmatics instruction through Nearpod on EFL learners' request performance. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 12(6), 67-78.
- Glaser, K. (2014). Inductive or deductive?: The impact of method of instruction on the acquisition of pragmatic competence in EFL. Cambridge scholars publishing.
- Glaser, K. (2018). Enhancing the role of pragmatics in primary English teacher training. *Glottodidactica. An International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 45(2), 119-131.
- Kentmen, H., Debreli, E., & Yavuz, M. A. (2023). Assessing tertiary Turkish EFL learners' pragmatic competence regarding speech acts and conversational implicatures. *Sustainability*, 15(4), 3800.
- Laughlin, V. T., Wain, J., & Schmidgall, J. (2015). Defining and operationalizing the construct of pragmatic competence: Review and recommendations. *ETS Research Report Series*, 2015(1), 1-43.

- Li, S., & Taguchi, N. (2014). The effects of practice modality on pragmatic development in L2 Chinese. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(3), 794-812.
- Lin, M. F., & Wang, Y. F. (2022). Effects of pragmatic instruction on EFL teenagers' apologetic email writing: Comprehension, production, and cognitive processes. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 60(3), 759-797.
- Martí-Arnándiz, O. (2008). Grammatical and pragmatic competence in EFL contexts: Do they really go hand in hand? In: E. Alcón-Soler (ed.), *Learning how to request in an instructed language learning context* (pp. 163–189). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Nguyen, M. T. T., Pham, H. T., & Pham, T. M. (2017). The effects of input enhancement and recasts on the development of second language pragmatic competence. *Innovation in Language learning and Teaching*, 11(1), 45-67.
- Pfingsthorn, J. / Flöck, I. (2017). Die Bemessung pragmatischer Sprachbewusstheit: Precision und recall im metalinguistischen Beurteilungstest. Paper presented at the 27th Conference of the DGFF [German Association for Foreign Language Research], Jena, Germany.
- Rajabia, S., Azizifara, A., & Gowhary, H. (2015). The effect of explicit instruction on pragmatic competence development; teaching requests to EFL learners of English. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199, 231-239.
- Rose, M. (2012). Grammar in the real world: Enhancing grammar lessons with pragmatics. *Hispania*, 670-680.
- Sickinger, P., & Schneider, K. P. (2014). Pragmatic competence and the CEFR: Pragmatic profiling as a link between theory and language use. *Linguistica*, 54(1), 113-127.
- Toprak, T., & Aksoyalp, Y. (2015). The Question of Re-Presentation In EFL Course Books: Are Learners of English Taught about New Zealand, 91-104.
- Tulgar, A. T. (2016). The role of pragmatic competence in foreign language education. *Turkish Online Journal of English Language Teaching*, 1(1), 10-19.
- Youn, S. J. (2014). Measuring syntactic complexity in L2 pragmatic production: Investigating relationships among pragmatics, grammar, and proficiency. *System*, 42, 270-287.
- Zeff, B. B. (2016). The Pragmatics of Greetings: Teaching Speech Acts in the EFL Classroom. In *English teaching forum* (Vol. 54, No. 1, pp. 2-11). US Department of State. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Office of English Language Programs, SA-5, 2200 C Street NW 4th Floor, Washington, DC 20037.
- Ziashahabi, S., Jabbari, A. A., & Razmi, M. H. (2020). The effect of interventionist instructions of English conversational implicatures on Iranian EFL intermediate level learners' pragmatic competence development. *Cogent Education*, 7(1), 1840008.