

Place of Pragmatics in EFL Classroom

^{1,*}Ali Akbar Khansir; ²Farhad Pakdel

¹Bushehr University of Medical Sciences, Bushehr, Iran; ²Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Shiraz, Iran

*Corresponding author: ahmad_2004_bu@yahoo.com

Abstract

This article's main aim was to discuss the place of Pragmatics in EFL classrooms. Pragmatics is one of the branches of linguistics concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker and interpreted by a listener. Pragmatics has relatively recently become the focuses of attention in language studies. On the other hand, it is important to remember that pragmatics components have been used in language teaching contexts in recent years, syllabus design by language teachers worldwide. Many research works have been done by many language researchers in different aspects of pragmatics competence. Language teachers use pragmatics as a functional approach in the language classroom. However, pragmatics follows the general principles for men when they communicate with others. Pragmatics study sentences not in isolation but regarding contexts of situations, and it is defined as the interaction between a sequence of language and the real-world situation in which it is used.

Keywords: Pragmatics, discourse and text, language teaching, English language, English language teaching.

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the place of Pragmatics in EFL classrooms. For the past many years, pragmatics has attracted second or foreign language researchers, curriculum developers, educationalists, language teachers, and language learners worldwide. The introduction of pragmatics into English language education has been one of the top processes. However, much of the research concerning pragmatics has been conducted to promote language learning in ELT classrooms. Crystal (2003) argues that the knowledge of pragmatics is needed in order to learn a second language. Bouton (1996, p. 11) mentions that "pragmatics provides language teachers and learners with a research-based understanding of the language forms and functions that are appropriate to the many contexts in which a language is used an understanding that is crucial to a proficient speaker's communicative competence." Shokouhi and Rezaei (2015, p. 101) say that "lack of pragmatic knowledge may

cause a failure in communication". Hui Chin Lin (2007) argues that pragmatics can pay attention more to the difficulties of international communications for both native and non-native speakers through teaching and learning. In teaching language, language learners should know the knowledge of pragmatics and other aspects of the language such as discourse, text, grammar, sounds system, and words to be successful in communication in their target language.

Before considering pragmatics in language teaching, we should know what communication is and its relationship with language. Communication is thus a network of interactions, and naturally, the sender and the receiver keep on changing their roles. Mohan and Banerji (2002, p. 25) say that "the term dyadic communication, in general, refers to an interaction between two persons." Bowman and Targowski (1987, pp. 22-23) mention that "language and communication occupy the central role in human activity and make possible the analysis and synthesis leading to knowledge and wisdom, but after thousands of years of recorded history, we still do not fully understand what happens when two people communicate." Littlewood (1994) argues that even though language and communication are not the same phenomena, but they are obviously linked to each other in inextricable ways. Communication enables someone else to recognize what we are willing to tell them, often referred to as our message. However, Paul Grice, one of the philosophers, has been recognized sometimes as the father of pragmatics. He concentrates that human beings communicate efficiently, and thus, he proposes four rules of conversations: 1) Maxim of quantity: give the right information when you talk; 2) Maxim of quality: be truthful, for example, if someone asks a question, you should reply truly; 3) Maxim of relevance: be relevant; 4) Maxim of manner: be clear and orderly. For example, you describe things in the order in which they occurred (Aitchison, 1992). Littlewood (1981), in his communicative language teaching book, emphasizes that we are ultimately concerned with developing the learners' ability to take part in the process of communicating through language rather than with their perfect mastery of individual structures. The important point to be mentioned here is that the primary aim of a communicative classroom is that students develop communicative competence in the English language. Thus, the development of communicative competence can help the students comprehend and produce written and spoken English in communicatively proficient and accurate ways. One of the language methods involved in language communication is communicative language teaching (CLT). Carter and Nunan (2001, p. 219) define communicative language teaching (CLT) as: "an approach to the teaching of language which emphasizes the uses of language by the learner in a range of contexts and for a range of purposes"; CLT emphasizes speaking and listening in real settings and does not only priorities the development of reading and writing skills; methodologies for CLT tend to encourage active learner involvement in a wide range of activities and tasks and strategies for

communication. Bose (2005) argues two basic of CLT: 1) Language is a means of communication; so the meaning is more important than form or structure, and learning a language means understanding and using it when the learner needs; 2) Learning involves the learner's mind (and so it is not habit formation); it is better facilitated while the learner is involved in mind-engaging activities using the language (Khansir 2014a).

English language teaching has always been an important subject in all universities over the world. Khansir (2014b, p. 838) argues that "many countries accepted the English language as the official language, it used as a medium of instruction in the society; other countries agreed it as a foreign language. Many researchers have done several English studies. Today, English is used as international communication among people all over the world. English as a second or foreign language, sometimes, lingua franca or third language used to link people together." In some countries, such as India has a vast population, the English language is used to link the population to gather. In education, Khansir and Pakdel (2016) indicate that the English language plays a vital role in education worldwide. Khansir (2013) says that the English language is used as an international language of business, science, and medicine. When the English language was established as an international system of education along with the development of universalization of education and expansion of educational opportunities to people over the world, the role of the English language more appeared to develop the English language as media of instruction among most countries and had a considerable influence on the ELT scenario in the world. In the case of the second and foreign language, there is, in most students, a social and educational need to learn English. Most of the learning time in universities for each subject, the learners have to get knowledge through the English language directly or indirectly. It is wonderful to watch a student learns the English language. Today, it is important to note that English has been used for real communication in the classroom. English language classroom aims to develop a general command of real English for language learners to use outside the classroom. Many theories have been used to enable the language learner to communicate in real English, both spoken and written and thus, pragmatics can be used as one of the theories enable English language learner to develop real communication for use inside and outside the classroom. We can conclude that pragmatics can be used as one of the primary goals of English courses to give English learners more opportunities to use English for communication in the classroom. Davies and Pearse (2002) emphasize that communication should be the main goal of all English teaching, and they add that a significant goal of all English language teaching should be to enable learners to use English effectively, as far as possible accurately, in communication.

Before inquiring directly pragmatics, let us investigate discourse and text as aspects of language communication briefly. The first linguist who defined discourse was Harris (1952). According to him, discourse is the next level in a hierarchy of morphemes, clauses, and sentences. Richards et al. (1992, p. 111) argue that "discourse is a general term for examples of language use, i.e., language which has been produced as the result of an act of communication." Potter (1997) mentions that discourse is the medium for interaction; analysis of discourse becomes, then analyzes what people do. Birjandi et al. (2006) list the characteristics of discourse: 1) Cohesion: refers to the use of selected linguistic elements to hold discourse together and to maintain comprehensibility (use of pronouns); 2) Coherence: refers to the product of planning and logical organization of the speaker and the listener's ability to understand the speaker's logic. Coherence is not a feature of language; it is a characteristic of the mind's organization of reality. 3) Speech Events: Conversations, debates, interviews, discussions, reports, and lectures are different forms native speakers use to facilitate communication. 4) Conversational interactions: Speakers use fixed phrases called 'gambits' to open, maintain, and close conversations. These facilitate conversational exchange rather than information communication. 5) Cooperative Principles: Speakers are required to provide all the necessary information when needed to accomplish the purpose of the conversation. 6) Flexibility: One of the mazing characteristics of human language is flexibility. Native speakers regularly shift from one register to another in response to social situations. Parker (1989, p. 7) defines "text as delimited tissues of meaning which may be written, spoken or reproduced in any form that can be given an interpretative gloss" (Khansir, 2012). Schiffrin (1995, p. 365) argues that "text is defined as the linguistic content: the stable semantic meanings of words, expressions, and sentences." According to the definitions, Khansir (2012) mentions that considering text and discourse as aspects of language communications in learning a second or more foreign language is necessary to help learners improve their language communication capability.

In this paragraph, it is interesting to consider an approach to a foreign and second language, and thus it is known as the goal of CLT is communicative competence. Hymes (1971) introduces communicative competence theory as a reaction to Chomsky's competence theory (1965). In addition, Munby (1985) argues that Hymes (1971) points out that Chomsky's categories of competence and performance provide no place for competency for language use; for example, the theory fails to account for a whole dimension the sociocultural. However, this new theory formed the basis of discourse analysis. It incorporates features like pragmatic and socio-cultural implications, speech acts and speech events, register, etc. The aim of Hymes theory is that develop the communicative competence in learners along with the grammatical competence and not merely the grammatical competence (Khansir

2012). According to the importance of communicative competence in communication purposes in language setting, Yano (1999) mentions that successful language use for communication presupposes the development of communicative competence in the users of that language and that the use of language is constrained by the socio-cultural norms of the society where the language is used. Thus, communicative competence teaches learners not merely structural efficiency but the practical use of the language. Gebhard (2009) argues that communicative competence has four interrelated components: 1) grammatical competency means to be able to recognize sentence-level grammatical forms, including lexical items (vocabulary, words), morphological items (most minor units of meaning, such as re-meaning again in remind), syntactic features (word order), and phonological features (consonant and vowel sounds, intonation patterns, and other aspects of the sound system). 2) discourse competency means the ability to interconnect a series of utterances (written or spoken) to form a meaningful text (letter, e-mail, essay, telephone conversation, formal speech/ or joke). In addition, Savignon (1997) mentions that discourse competency includes text coherence and cohesion. 3) socio-cultural competency includes the ability to use English in social contexts in culturally appropriate ways. 4) Communicative competence includes strategic competency or the ability to cope with breakdowns in communication, problem solve in unfamiliar contexts when communication fails, and draw on strategies that help restore communication. Ellis (2003, p. 76) mentions that "communication strategies are an important component of strategic competence, i.e., the competence required to make effective use of one's linguistic and pragmatic resources." However, Cook (2008, p. 112) adds that "communication strategies are a natural part of conversational interaction that people fall back on when they have difficulty in getting things across."

What is Pragmatics?

Charles Morris suggested pragmatics as a new field of linguistic analysis within semiotics in 1938 to label the science of the relation of signs to their interpreters. The main aim of pragmatics is to help the communication of human beings through language. The language of the human being is at the center of human life. Helping language learners acquire their target language more effectively is an important task of pragmatics for several years. Pragmatics requires language learners to talk to each other because they recognize their target language learning as growing out of giving and taking of communication. A question arises what pragmatics is. Pragmatics has been defined by many researcher scholars in various ways, for example, Yule (2000) mentions pragmatics is concerned with the four areas: 1) pragmatics is the study of

speaker meaning; 2) pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning; 3) pragmatics is the study of how more gets communicated than is said, and 4) pragmatics is the study of the expression of relative distance. Aitchison (1992) argues that pragmatics is the branch of linguistics that studies those aspects of meaning which cannot be captured by semantic theory. He (1992) adds that pragmatics deals with how speakers use language in ways that cannot be predicted from linguistic knowledge alone. Pragmatics can be used as conventions for conveying and interpreting the meaning of linguistic strings within their contexts and settings (Brown, 2007). Ferrara (1985, p. 138) says pragmatics is "the systematic study of the relations between the linguistic properties of utterances and their properties as social action." LoCastro (2012; p. 5) adds that "social action denotes the premise that human beings engage in action whenever they use language." Abrams (2000, p. 142) argues that "pragmatics is a study of the understanding of the implied meaning of interactions." Verschueren (1999) defines pragmatics as the study of language use or employs a somewhat more complicated phrasing, studying linguistic phenomena from the point of view of their usage properties and processes. Fasold and Connorlinton (2006, p. 157) mention that "pragmatics concerns both the relationship between the context of use and sentence meaning, and the relationship among sentence meaning, the context of use, and speaker's meaning." Holmes (2008) argues that pragmatics extends the analysis of meaning beyond grammar and word meaning to the relationship between the participants and the background knowledge they bring to a situation. She adds that pragmatics is concerned with the analysis of meaning in interaction. Richards et al. (1992) define pragmatics as the study of the use of language in communication, particularly the relationship between sentences and the contexts and situations in which they are used. According to Richards et al. (1992), pragmatics includes the study of 1) how the interpretation and use of utterances depend on knowledge of the real world; 2) how speakers use and understand speech acts; 3) how the structure of sentences is influenced by the relationship between the speaker and the hearer.

We can say that pragmatics is concerned with language meaning in discourse when used in an appropriate context to achieve particular aims. Context helps people to guess the meanings of the words. Pragmatic meaning is not, we should note, an alternative to semantic meaning but complementary to it because it is inferred from the interplay of semantic meaning with context.

According to Crystal (1987, p. 120), pragmatics has been defined as "the study of the principles and practice underlying all interactive linguistic performance. This includes all aspects of language usage, understanding and appropriateness." Manjula and Banumathy (2007) argue that pragmatics is the area of language function that embraces the use of language in social contexts. It is all about what to say, how to say and when to say – and how to be with other people. In addition, Pragmatic in

general is concerned with questions such as: 1) What does a listener suppose a speaker to intend to communicate by a given message? And how is this meaning decoded? 2) What persons, entities, etc., does the message refer to? 3) What background knowledge is needed to understand a given message? 4) How do the beliefs of speaker and listener interact in the interpretation of a given message or of a given dialogue exchange? 5) What is a relevant answer to a given question? (Mitkov, 2003). LoCstro (2012) supports the above sentences by this definition of pragmatics; pragmatics is primarily and fundamentally interested not only in the meaning of the words of the talk but also how human beings can get from what is said in words to the communicative purpose beyond the words of any piece of talk. He adds that a question such as the following is the base that drives the thinking of researchers in pragmatics: how do we assign speaker meaning to this talk?

Aspects of Pragmatics

In this paragraph, we try to define aspects of pragmatics such as Indexicality, Presupposition, Implicature, Speech acts. According to Fasold and Connorlinton (2006), indexicals are words whose semantic meaning depends directly on the context of use. Some simple examples are, I, you, here, and how. The second aspect of pragmatics is called 'presupposition.' Richards et al. (1992, p. 288) mention that " what a speaker or writer assumes that the receiver of the message already knows. For example, 'Ali stopped laughing at noon'; it is assumed that Ali was laughing just before noon. We can conclude that the sentence Ali stopped laughing at noon presupposes that Ali was laughing before noon. However, many words, phrases, and structures create presuppositions in a language. The third aspect of pragmatics in this paragraph is 'Implicature.' Crystal (1992, p. 183) argues that implicature is used as an implication or suggestion deduced from the form of an utterance. He adds that there are two kinds of implicature: 1) "a conversational implicature uses the cooperative principles which govern the efficiency of conversations; for example, if someone says Look, the train! While approaching a railway station, the implication is we must hurry; "2) "a conventional implicature is simply attached by convention to particular expressions," as when what is yours? - said at a restaurant, implies 'I am buying you a soft drink.' However, the last aspect of pragmatics is known as 'Speech acts.' Austin established the speech act. Richards et al. (1992, pp. 342-343) say that speech is an utterance as a functional unit in communication. They add that utterances have two kinds of meaning in speech act theory: 1) propositional meaning or locutionary meaning. It is the basic literal meaning of the utterance conveyed by the particular words and structures that the utterance contains. 2) illocutionary

meaning or illocutionary force. This is the effect the utterance or written text has on the reader or listener. Austin (1962) categories three part of speech acts as follows:

- 1) Locutionary act: the literal, basic meaning of the proposition, the lexicogrammatical meaning that has true value and sense; that is, the proposition or sentence describes a state of affairs and has determinate meaning;
- 2) Illocutionary act: the speech act or force, showing the intention of the speaker; how the act is to be understood by the addressee;
- 3) Perlocutionary act: the effect on the addressee, unpredictable, possibly nonlinguistic.

Archer et al. (2012) differentiate between direct and indirect speech acts; they mention that indirect speech act captures the fact that we do not always say literally what we mean. However, hearers normally have no difficulty in interpreting what is said based on inference. When there is a conventional relationship between sentence type and speech act (illocutionary force), we directly act.

Pragmatics Competence

Let us consider first Chomsky competence as a theory of linguistic coined by Chomsky. This theory refers to speakers' knowledge of their language. According to this theory, the speakers have mastered the system rules of their language to produce and understand an indefinite of sentences and recognize grammatical mistakes and ambiguities (Crystal, 2003). Pragmatic competence has recently been used by language researchers in second or foreign language studies. Crystal (1991) relates pragmatic competence to the use of language in social interactions. Crystal (2003, p. 364) mentions that "in a narrow linguistic view, pragmatics deals only with those aspects of context which are formally encoded in the structure of a language; they would be part of a user's pragmatic competence." Johnson and Johnson (1999) argue that pragmatic competence is an aspect of communicative competence, and it refers to the ability to communicate appropriately in particular contexts of use.

Bachman and Palmer (1982) define pragmatic competence as the knowledge necessary, in addition to organizational competence, for appropriately producing or comprehending discourse. Specifically, it includes illocutionary competence, knowing how to perform speech acts, sociolinguistic competence, or the knowledge of the sociolinguistic conventions that govern language use. On the other hand, we try to discuss pragmatic competence through language knowledge was proposed by Bachman (1990). According to his definition, language knowledge includes two broad categories: organizational knowledge and pragmatic knowledge (pragmatic competence). The first category is involved in controlling the formal structure of

language for producing or comprehending grammatically acceptable utterances or sentences, for organizing these to form texts, both oral and written. Thus, organizational knowledge includes grammatical knowledge and textual knowledge. Pragmatic knowledge was the second category was established by Bachman. He argues that pragmatic knowledge enables us to create or interpret discourse by relating utterances or sentences and texts to their meanings, language users' intentions, and relevant characteristics of the language use setting. In addition, pragmatic knowledge consists of functional knowledge and sociolinguistic knowledge. Functional knowledge enables us to interpret relationships between utterances or sentences and texts and the intentions of language users, whereas sociolinguistic knowledge enables us to create or interpret language appropriate to a particular language use setting. Mousavi (1999) adds that sociolinguistic knowledge includes knowledge of the conventions that determine the appropriate use of dialects or varieties, registers, natural or idiomatic expressions, cultural references, and figures of speech. Tajeddin (2015) says that pragmatic competence comprises illocutionary competence (conceived as knowledge of both speech acts and language functions) and sociolinguistic competence (termed as knowledge of the contextual appropriateness). Bachman and Palmer's (1996) pragmatic competence is redefined to include elements of Bachman and Palmer's sociolinguistic competence and those abilities related to the functions performed through language use.

Tajeddin (2015, p. 16) says that pragmatic competence has focused on three-fold: 1) The emerging theoretical enthusiasm to explore a neglected component of communicating competence, particularly in view of its significance as one of the two principal components of language competence (Bachman, 1990); 2) New trends in interlanguage studies which view pragmatic competence as a field of study pertaining to interlanguage pragmatics; 3) The necessity of providing students for the acquisition of pragmatics or speech acts". Van Dijk (1977, p. 190) distinguishes between two aspects of pragmatics: a) The examination of the pragmatic conditions that determine whether or not a given utterance is acceptable to other users of the language as an act or the performance of an intended function; b) the characterization of the conditions that determine which utterances are successful in which situations". He adds that pragmatics is thus concerned with the relationships between utterances and the acts of functions that speakers (or writers) intend to perform through these utterances. Therefore, pragmatic competence has two subcomponents, namely pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics, that both of them are used as the two composites of pragmatics. Markkanen (1985, p. 10) mentions that,

"pragmalinguistics considers what resources for conveying particular illocutions are found in a given language and socio-pragmatics studies how pragmatic principles operate in different

cultures, in different social situations, among different social classes. Hence, we can imagine a pragmatic measure which approximates grammar (that is, the study of the structure of language) on the one hand, and sociology, on the other."

Archer et al. (2012) add that sociopragmatic focuses on how people use language in conversation, debates, courtroom examinations, and how they use language for their social goals.

How to Teach Pragmatic Competence

Before we start teaching pragmatic competence in English language teaching, let us examine why we use English as a foreign language. However, Khansir (2010) mentions that English is neither an official language nor a medium of instruction or business communication. Khansir (2010) adds that English as a foreign language is often taught in schools, but it does not play an essential role in national or social life. The researchers of this paper believe that English as a foreign language for the countries, English used as a foreign language, is necessary to communicate with the whole world. They need changes in the educational system, new language teaching/learning policies, new curriculum and materials, and welcoming new opinions and criticisms about the present status of English in the countries.

There are many instructional strategies for teaching pragmatic competence such as implicit and explicit, inductive and deductive; many language researchers in target language have used learner's factors such as motivation. Let us now define learning strategies, and then we continue our discussion about teaching pragmatic competence. Oxford (1990) argues that learning strategies are steps taken by students to enhance their own learning. He adds that strategies are especially important for language learning because they are tools for active, self-directed involvement, essential for developing communicative competence. First of all, implicit and explicit strategies can be used to teach pragmatic competence in ESL or EFL settings. Ellis (1994, p. 1) argues that "implicit learning is the acquisition of knowledge about the underlying structure of a complex stimulus environment by a process which takes place naturally, simply and without conscious operations." Ellis (2003) differentiates between implicit and explicit knowledge; thus, implicit knowledge refers to knowledge of a language that a speaker manifests in performance but has no awareness of, whereas explicit knowledge refers to knowledge about language that speakers are aware of and, if asked, can verbalize. Tajeddin (2015) emphasizes that most studies have shown that explicit instruction is more effective than implicit instruction in teaching pragmatic competence. Richards

et al. (1992) define deductive learning as an approach to language teaching in which learners are taught rules and given specific information about a language. They then apply these rules when they use the language.

Deductive learning is contrasted with inductive learning. They add that inductive learning is an approach to language teaching in which learners are not taught grammatical or other types of rules directly but are left to discover or induce rules from their experience of using the language. Tajeddin (2015) argues that results for complement responses manifested a positive effect only for the deductive group in developing sociopragmatic proficiency. Kubota (1995) investigates the effects of both deductive and inductive instruction in the acquisition of implicature, with an advantage for the inductive approach over the deductive one. Motivation term is used frequently by language teachers when they describe successful or unsuccessful learners. Motivation is another factor that can be used in developing pragmatic competence; Ushioda (2013) mentions that "motivation is widely recognized as a significant factor influencing success in second or foreign language learning, is perhaps one of the key variables that distinguish first language acquisition from second language acquisition." Niezgodna and Roevers (2011) indicate that motivation might be an individual variable influencing English learners' sensitivity to pragmatic errors. The finding of Takahashi (2005) shows that motivation to be closely related to pragmatic awareness.

Semantics

Pragmatics cannot be adequately studied without touching upon the notion of semantics. However, semantics and pragmatics are the study of meaning communicated through language. Semantics is one of the components of disciplines of linguistics such as phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax is related to a specific unit of analysis, and one of the specific units of semantics can be called pragmatics. Semantics is one of the aspects of linguistics that deals with the relations between names and things: linguistic levels (words, phrases) and the objects, concepts to which they refer – and with the history and changes in the meaning of words. Varshney (1998) argues that semantics is the study of meaning, and it is derived from the Greek noun "sema" sign, signal, and the verb "semains" signal, mean, signify. Semantics consists of translating utterances from natural language into the language of semantic representation. Semantics can be regarded as an activity in language teaching. Palmer (1981) mentions that semantics is the technical term used to refer to the study of meaning. And then argues that meaning is a part of language, and thus, semantics is a part of linguistics. He adds that semantics is a

component of linguistics of the same kind as phonetics or grammar. We can get the meaning of words within the framework of scientific discipline. However, semantics is part of linguistics, and linguistics is known as the scientific study of language. Chalker & Weiner (2011, p. 355) say that "semantics is the study or analysis of the relationship between linguistic forms and meaning." Plag et al. (2007, p. 135) mention that "semantics is the study of the structure of meaning." Saeed (2009) says that semantics is the study of the meanings of words and sentences. However, generally, semantics is defined what Richards et al. (1985) argue as the study of meaning. They add that there are many different approaches to how meaning in language is studied.

Difference between Semantics and Pragmatics

However, semantics is different from pragmatics. Fasold & Connorlinton (2006) argue that semantics focuses on the literal meanings of words, phrases, and sentences; it is concerned with how grammatical processes build complex meaning out of simpler ones, whereas pragmatics focuses on the use of language in a particular situation; it aims to explain how factors outside of language contribute to both literal meaning and nonliteral meanings which speakers communicate using language. Finch (2000) believes that one of the differences between semantics and pragmatics is that pragmatics is a relatively newer area of linguistics than semantics. Morris (1955) differentiates between pragmatics and semantics; he adds that semantics are the relations of signs to the objects to which the signs are applicable, whereas pragmatics is the relation of signs to interpreters. Saeed (2009) argues that semantics is concerned with sentence meaning, whereas pragmatics is concerned with speaker meaning. Johnson & Johnson (1999) mention that pragmatics is concerned with meaning varies with context, whereas semantics is sometimes described as concerned with the relation of linguistic forms to states of the world. Birner (2013) argues that the literal meaning is the domain of semantics, and the additional meaning is the domain of pragmatics.

Conclusion

Teaching the English language has some of the most complex problems in the EFL classroom. One of the biggest problems is that English is used as a foreign language; it does not play an essential role in national or social life of the people. This paper attempts not to solve them but introduces pragmatics as one of the branches of linguistics established by Charles Morris in 1938. In addition, Morris makes a

tripartite division of semiotics in syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. According to him, syntax describes the combinatory possibility of signs; semantics shows the relationship between signs and their denotata; finally, pragmatics refers to the relationship between signs and their interpreters. LoCastro (2012, p. 12) indicates that pragmatics overlaps with several other approaches to language analysis: sociolinguistics, conversation analysis, discourse analysis, ethnography of speaking to name the most common."

As Leech (1983) sees, a central definition of pragmatics competence sees pragmatic competence as the speaker's and writer's ability to accomplish goals that require getting things done and attending to interpersonal relationships with other participants. Many instructional strategies for teaching pragmatic competence: implicit and explicit; inductive and deductive; motivation is necessary for EFL students to promote their language knowledge and use English flawlessly. In addition, the study of pragmatic competence is still new in linguistics; thus, given the increasing the study of pragmatic competence in EFL setting is more required to help EFL learners acquire the English language.

References

- Abrams, M.H. (2000). *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. New Delhi: Harcourt India Private Limited.
- Aitchison, J. (1992). *Linguistics*. Great Britain: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Archer, D, Aijmer, K, & Wichman, A. (2012). *Pragmatics: An advanced resource book for students*. USA: Routledge.
- Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bachman, L.F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bachman, L.F., & Palmar, A.S. (1982). The construct validation of some components of communicative proficiency. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16 (4), 449-465.
- Bachman, L.F., & Palmar, A.S. (1996). *Language testing in practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Birjandi, P., Mosallanejad, P., & Bagheridoust, E. (2006). *Principles of Teaching Foreign Language*. Tehran: Rahrovan publications.
- Birner, B. J. (2013). *Introduction to Pragmatics*. UK: Willy-Blackwell.
- Bin-Hady, W. R. A. (2019). A Suggested Technique for Cooperative Learning Implication in EFL Classroom: Mixed Methods Research. *Khazar Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 22 (4), 113-127. Available from: 10.5782/2223-2621.2019.22.4.113
- Bose, M. N. K. (2005). *English Language Teaching (ELT) for Indian students*. Chennai: New Century Book House.

- Bouton, L. F. (1996). *Pragmatics and Language Learning*. Pragmatics and Language Learning Monograph Series, 7, 1-20.
- Bowman, J.P. & Targowski, A. S. (1987). Modeling the communication process: the map is not the territory. *Journal of Business Communication*, 24 (4), 65-73.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. United States of America: Pearson Longman.
- Carter, R. & Nunan, D. (2001). *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chalker, S. & Weiner, E. (2011). *The Oxford Dictionary of English Grammar*. New Delhi: OPU.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The M.I.T. Press.
- Cook, V. (2008). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. Great Britain: Hodder Education.
- Crystal, D. (1987). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (1991). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Crystal, D. (1992). *An Encyclopedic Dictionary of Language and Languages*. USA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. USA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Davies, P. & Pearse, E. (2002). *Success in English Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, N. (1994). *Implicit and Explicit Learning of Languages*. London: Academic Press.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Fasold, R.W. & Connorlinton, J. (2006). *An Introduction to Language and Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferrara, A. (1985). *Pragmatics. Handbook of discourse analysis*. London: Academic Press.
- Finch, G. (2000). *Linguistic Terms and Concepts*. UK: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Gebhard, J.G. (2009). *Teaching English as a Foreign or Second Language*. USA: Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press.
- Harris, Z. (1952). Discourse Analysis. *Language Learning*, 28, 1-30.
- Holmes, J. (2008). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. UK: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hui Chin Lin, G. (2007). The Significance of Pragmatics. *Mingdao Journal*, 3 (2), 91-102.
- Hymes, D. (1971). on *communicative competence*. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings* (pp. 269-285). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Johnson, K. & Johnson, H. (1999). *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*. UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Khansir, A.A. (2010). *A Comparative Linguistic Study of Errors*. Germany: Lap Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Khansir, A.A. (2012). Aspects of Language Communication: Discourse and Text. *International Journal of Communication*, 22 (1-2), 167-181.
- Khansir, A.A. (2013). Applied Linguistics and English Language Teaching. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 15 (8), 1140-1146.

- Khansir, A.A. (2014a). Trends of Language Methods in Second Language Acquisition. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World (IJLLALW)*, 6 (2), 259-268.
- Khansir, A. A. (2014b). Teaching English is Art and English Teacher is Artist. *International J. Soc. Sci. & Education*, 4 (4), 838-843.
- Khansir, A. A., & Pakdel, F. (2016). Place of Linguistics in English Language Teaching. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)* 7 (3), 373-384.
- Kubota, M. (1995). Teachability of conversational implicature to Japanese EFL learners? The Institute for Research in language Teaching. *Bulletin (IRLT Bulletin)*, 9, 35-67.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Littlewood, W. (1994). *Teaching Oral Communication*. UK: Blackwell Publishers.
- LoCastro, V. (2012). *Pragmatics for Language Educators*. London: Rout ledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Manjula, R & Banumathy, N. (2007). Praxis Control and Its Influence on Pragmatic Skills in Developmental Apraxia of Speech. *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics*, XXXVI, 2, 101-111.
- Markkanen, R. (1985). *Cross- language studies in pragmatics*. Jyvaskyla: The University of Jyvaskyla Press.
- Mitkov, R. (2003). *The Oxford Handbook of Computational Linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mohan, K. & Banerji, M. (2002). *Developing Communication Skills*. New Delhi: Rajiv Beri for Macmillan India Ltd.
- Morris, C. (1955). *Signs, Language and Behavior*. New York: George Braziller.
- Mousavi, S. A. (1999). *A Dictionary of Language Testing*. Tehran: Rhanma Publications.
- Munby, J. (1985). *Communicative Syllabus Design*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Niezgoda, K & Roever, C. (2011). *Pragmatic and grammatical awareness: A function of the learning environment?* In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (eds), *Pragmatic in Language Teaching* (pp. 63-79). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R.L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies*. USA: Heinle, Cengage Learning.
- Palmar, F.R. (1981). (2nd edition) *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Parker, L. (1989). *The crisis in modern social psychology and how to end it*. London: Routledge.
- Plag, I., Braun, M., Lappe, S., & Schramm, M. (2007). *Introduction to English linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Potter, J. (1997). *Discourse analysis as a way of analyzing naturally occurring talk*. In L.A. Wood & R. O. Kroger (Eds.), *Doing Discourse Analysis: Methods for Studying Action in Talk and Text*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Richards, J.C., Platt, J., & Weber, H. (1985). *Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Richards, J.C, Platt, J. & Platt, H. (1992). *Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. Essex: Longman.

- Saeed, J. I. (2009). *Semantics*. UK: Blackwell Publisher Ltd.
- Savignon, S. (1997). *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Schiffrin, D. (1995). *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Shokouhi, S & Rezaei, A. (2015). The Importance of Teaching Pragmatics in the Classrooms (Focus on Complimenting). *Journal for the Study of English Linguistics*, 3 (1), 101-107.
- Tajeddin, Z. (2015). *Interlanguage Pragmatics and language Teaching*. Tehran: Jungle Publication.
- Takahashi, S. (2005). Pragmalinguistic awareness: Is it related to motivation and proficiency? *Applied Linguistics*, 26 (1), 90-120.
- Targowski, A.S. & Bowman, J. P. (1988). The layer-based pragmatic model of the communication process. *Journal of Business Communication*, 25 (1), 5-24.
- Ushioda, E. (2013). *International Perspectives on Motivation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1977). *Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse*. London: Longman.
- Varshney, R.L. (1998). *An Introductory Text Book of Linguistics and Phonetics*. India: Student Store, Rampur Bagh, BAREILLY-243001.
- Verschueren, J. (1999). *Understanding Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yano, Y. (1999). What is it to learn a foreign language?: Nonnative speaker English in the twenty-first century. *Second Language Research in Japan*, 10, 42-60.
- Yule, G. (2000). *Pragmatics*. England: Oxford University Press.