Journal Of the Iraqia University (77-1) 30 September (2026)

ISSN(Print): 1813-4521 OnLine ISSN:2663-7502
Journal Of the Iraqia University
available online at
https://iasj.rdd.edu.iq/journals/journal/view/247

The Role of Pragmatic Awareness in Enhancing Second Language Writing Skill: A Study of Indirect Speech Acts

Noor Raheem Neamah
Department of English, College of Education, University of Maysan, Maysan, Iraq
nourraheem19941979@gmail.com

دور الوعي البراغماتي في تعزيز مهارة الكتابة باللغة الثانية: دراسة لأفعال الكلام غير المباشرة

نور رحيم نعمة
مكان العمل: قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية التربية، جامعة ميسان، ،العراق

الملخص

هدفت هذه الدراسة إلى بحث دور الوعي البراغماتي في تحسين مهارات الكتابة باللغة الثانية في جامعة ميسان بالعراق. وتتناول الدراسة أفعال الكلام غير المباشرة. يشمل مجتمع الدراسة جميع الطلاب المسجلين حاليًا في برنامج اللغة الإنجليزية بجامعة ميسان. تألفت عينة الدراسة من ٩٠ طالبًا جامعيًا يدرسون اللغة الإنجليزية في جامعة ميسان، وقُسّموا إلى مجموعتين (ضابطة وتجريبية). بلغ عدد المشاركين في كل مجموعة ٤٥ مشاركًا (٢٠ ذكرًا و٢٥ أنثى). استمرت الدراسة لمدة أربعة أسابيع، وتراوحت أعمار الطلاب بين ١٨ و٢٤ عامًا. يستند الإطار النظري لهذه الدراسة إلى نظرية أفعال الكلام وعلم البراغماتية، اللذين يوضحان كيفية توليد المعنى من خلال الاستخدام المناسب للغة في السياق، وليس فقط من خلال البنية النحوية للغة. أظهرت نتائج الدراسة أن الطلاب الذين تلقوا تدريبًا يهدف إلى مساعدتهم على تطوير الوعي البراغماتي بأفعال الكلام غير المباشرة حققوا أداءً أفضل من الطلاب الذين لم يتلقوا هذا التدريب في تقييم الكتابة باللغة الثانية. ويركز البحث أيضاً على كيفية إسهام فهم أساليب الكلام غير المباشرة في تحسين الكتابة. كما يُنصح الباحثون بدراسة تأثير الجوانب التداولية الأخرى (مثل استراتيجيات اللباقة وعلامات الخطاب) وكيفية تأثيرها على القدرة على الكتابة والتحدث باللغتين الإنجليزية واللغة المستهدفة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: اكتساب اللغة الأجنبية، ومهارات الكتابة، والتعليم، ومهارات الكلام، وتعليم الوعي البراغماتي

Abstract

The study aimed to investigate the role of pragmatic awareness in enhancing second language writing skill at the University of Misan in Iraq. It is a study of Indirect Speech Acts. The population of this study includes all students who are currently studying English language at the University of Misan in Iraq. The sample consisted of 90 university students who are studying English language at the University of Misan. It is divided into 2 groups (Control and experimental groups). The number in each group is 45 participants (20 males and 25 females). The duration of teaching university students is 4 weeks, and their age is between 18 and 24. This research's theoretical framework is rooted in the Speech Act Theory and pragmatics that establish how meaning is generated by the context-appropriate use of language, rather than only on the grammatical structure of the language. The study findings showed that the students who receive instruction intended to help them develop pragmatic awareness of indirect speech acts will perform better than students who do not receive this instruction on a second language writing assessment. It also focuses on how understanding indirect speech acts can contribute to improved writing. Researchers are also recommended to investigate the effects of other pragmatic aspects (such as politeness strategies and discourse markers) and how they affect the ability to write and speak in both English and the target language.

Keywords: Acquiring foreign language, writing skill, education, speech acts, teaching pragmatic awareness.

1. Introduction

Developing high-quality writing in an L2 involves having an ample vocabulary and using grammar accurately. Karpava (2025) reports that L2 learners of English tend to favor conventional forms of indirectness when making requests, indicating that L1 linguistic and cultural contexts affect the way they express politeness. House and Kádár (2025) indicate that developing a pragmatic awareness as to what the uses of indirect speech acts will determine how meaning is created and interpreted within written communication. Rafiq and Yavuz (2024) report that indirectness is a frequent aspect of everyday communication, and a large number of L2 learners have difficulty identifying its function or reproducing it adequately when writing. They write linguistically correct texts, but now, they are pragmatically ineffective. The increasing need for global communication to be sensitive to politeness, nuance, and implied meaning, and how pragmatic instruction enhances L2 writing, is now both urgent and necessary.Writing skill is dependent upon the writer's ability to use language in socially and contextually appropriate ways. Bardovi-Harlig (2017) argues that the concept of pragmatic awareness has been entirely absorbed in the L2 pragmatics literature. She views pragmatic awareness as a precursor to pragmatic competence and that it is something that instruction can foster. Martinez-Flor and Soler (2007) suggest that using pragmatic awareness as an instructional objective has two benefits for students; first, it allows them to identify their own pragmatic objectives, and second, it provides them with the information they need to make decisions regarding their pursuit of L2 pragmatics. Eslami-Rasekh (2005) states that the literature about awareness can be categorized as follows: Pedagogical Papers, Tests of Awareness, and Instructional Effect Studies. Martinez-Buffa and Safont (2023) state that pedagogical recommendations are explicit operationalization of awareness according to Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis. The Developmental Studies of Awareness examine the claims made by the Noticing Hypothesis through the question of what learners notice and if that will lead to acquisition. Abdulrahman (2012) suggests that instructional effect studies incorporate both the pedagogical operationalization of awareness and tests of awareness with language production before and after instruction.The purpose of this study is to identify the impact that developing pragmatic awareness has on students' ability to produce coherent, communicative writing, and contextually appropriate. It also focuses on how understanding indirect speech acts can contribute to improved writing.

1.1 Research Problem

At the University of Misan, a consistent problem for many students who are currently learning a second language is that they have difficulty using indirect speech acts accurately. This results in inaccurate pragmatics, misunderstandings, and a reduction in the effectiveness of their communication. Students may know the grammar, but they may lack sufficient pragmatic awareness to produce writing that meets culturally and socially acceptable norms. This deficit indicates the importance of exploring how increasing pragmatic awareness (especially for indirect speech) can increase the ability of learners to communicate effectively and to be competent writers.

1.2 Research Objective

To determine whether improving learners' pragmatic knowledge, specifically in relation to indirect speech acts, will increase their writing abilities in a second language (L2) at the University of Misan.

1.3 Research Question

To what context does an increase in the pragmatic awareness that learners have about indirect speech acts enhance their Second Language (L2) Writing Skills at the University of Misan?

1.4 Hypothesis

H1: The students who receive instruction intended to help them develop pragmatic awareness of indirect speech acts will perform better than students who do not receive this instruction on a second language writing assessment at the University of Misan.

H2: The teaching of pragmatic awareness of indirect speech acts does not affect students' second language writing performance at the University of Misan.

1.5 Research Significance

This study has relevance as it demonstrates that students who are aware of pragmatics, especially indirect speech act usage, can create writing that is culturally appropriate, contextual, and communicative in nature. This particular study addresses the social and learning needs of students who are currently studying at the University of Misan. Thus, it offers recommendations and suggestions to textbook writers, educators, and researchers regarding how to support the development of pragmatic competence in addition to improving second language writing. It also contributes to developing better language proficiency.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Framework

This research's theoretical framework is rooted in the Speech Act Theory and pragmatics that establish how meaning is generated by the context-appropriate use of language, rather than only on the grammatical structure of the language. The speech act theory evolved from the work of Austin, who introduced some basic concepts in a series of lectures given in the early 1975. Austin's conceptualization of the speech act theory was further formalized and extended into linguistic and communications areas by Searle in 1969. The two have collectively created the foundation for what is now called speech act theory. Martínez-Flor and Soler (2007) explain that a significant number of studies have focused on the use of instruction to develop learners' pragmatic competence in both Second Language (SL) and Foreign Language (FL) contexts. Most of these recent studies have adopted an explicit instructional method to pragmatic development. However, there are only a few studies that have tried to carry out a more implicit method of pragmatic learning.A number of researchers have investigated how both explicit and implicit training can affect a learner's pragmatic abilities. Rafiq & Yavuz (2024) also think it is important to develop pragmatic competence as this will allow learners to be able to communicate more effectively in different social and cultural settings using English. According to Korkmaz & Karatepe (2023), Pragmatic Competence is the ability to utilize language efficiently in a specific environment and to follow the rules and customs of society. This competency is crucial for university students to express themselves effectively and develop positive relationships with their peers and instructors, in addition to participating in academic and social events. Developing pragmatic competence will help students develop high-level, analytical, evaluative, and synthetic thinking skills, which involve critically analyzing, evaluating, and combining information to solve complex problems and make informed decisions. Sanchez-Hernandez and Martinez-Flor (2022) explain that Pragmatic Competence is connected to several traits that are needed to succeed in both the university setting and outside of it. Pragmatic Competence can positively affect a student's academic performance because it allows them to communicate messages more effectively and accurately comprehend verbal or written communication.Language instruction has evolved throughout its history from being based on form-focused methods to communicative-based methods. Savvidou and Economidou-Kogetsidis (2019) explain that Communicative Language Teaching aims to improve the communicative competence of language learners. Developing the learners' pragmatic competence is essential to Communicative Language Teaching as pragmatic competence plays a significant role in human life and relationships. Su (2021) explains that to be able to communicate effectively, a person needs both linguistic knowledge and pragmatic knowledge, including both socio-pragmatic competence, which includes the influence of the social context upon language usage, and pragma-linguistic competence, which involves an understanding of all possible language expressions that can be utilized to realize a particular speech act. Azam and Saleem (2018) indicate that there is increasing recognition among language instructors and researchers of the use of pragmatics in teaching second and foreign languages. The pragmatic ability is used in the field of L2 Pragmatics to describe a learner's ability to comprehend and carry out socially and culturally relevant communication acts. As indicated by Xin (2007), it is one of the most important parts of communicative competence.Pragmatic awareness is the combination of grammar and pragmatic knowledge, allowing individuals to speak effectively. Thus, developing pragmatic competence is a vital part of the language learning process; learners of L2 must possess pragmatic competence, since it involves the proper application of the target language (TL). Ashraf and Ali (2021) indicate that some of the grammatical rules that are taught in the classroom may be properly applied in everyday life situations. The issues of using language may lead to issues with society and misunderstandings when interacting in social environments. This is why it is imperative to have pragmatic training not only in a foreign language environment, but also in a second language environment, as evidenced by the difficulties that Pakistani students experience in utilizing the English language. In addition to the research conducted by Searle and Austin, the current study views indirect speech acts as the most common method used in softening force (i.e., "softening" what would otherwise be perceived as too forceful), politeness, and expressing socially acceptable intentions, particularly when using written forms of communication. The current study is connected to the area of Interlanguage Pragmatics, which examines how adult second language learners are able to utilize language appropriately in line with target language norms. From a pedagogical perspective, the current study was also developed from Communicative Competence models, which place a major emphasis on developing students' pragmatic competence as a vital aspect of successful L2 writing. Together, these two frameworks of theory will

provide the foundation for an understanding of the impact that increasing learners' awareness of pragmatics may have on their ability to produce both contextually sensitive and communicatively effective written texts.

2.2 Empirical Studies

The following empirical studies aim to clarify the content of this topic. House and Kádár (2025) focused their research on the interaction and speech acts of second language pragmatics. This paper argues that L2 Pragmatic Research must develop new methods for combining speech acts with interaction by developing a radically minimal, finite, and interactional typology of speech acts. Below, we explain what we understand when we say "speech acts" and "interaction", but first, the following summary describes the main problem addressed in our study: The authors of the article define how speakers behave when using language, at times defining language use through terms such as 'suggest', 'request', etc., which generally provide an approximate value of the illocutionary force; alternatively through terms such as 'agree', 'accept', 'contradict', 'turn down', 'refuse' that generally describe the importance of the utterance relative to the previous one. They therefore have to differentiate between these two elements of a communicative act - the illocutionary and the interactional.Karpava's (2025) study focused specifically on the L2 English pragmatic competence and awareness of L2 English request strategies, including L2 English direct. It includes request perspective and internal and external modifications. His study focused on how tasks affected the use of these strategies. In total, 80 Cypriot Greek undergraduate students made up the participant group for this study. The researchers created the pragmatic tests using Speech Act Theory and completed them with two types of tests: discourse completion tasks and multiple-choice questionnaires. The researchers used role-playing and interviews to measure the oral discourse of L2 learners' pragmatic competence. The tasks presented four different conditions to measure the effects of power and social distance on language. They are social distance, status equals, social distance, and dominance. The data analyses also showed variation in context but no significant task effect. Thus, factors such as social distance, familiarity, and imposition influenced the amount of directness, request perspective, and external and internal modification. Martinez-Buffa and Safont (2023) conducted a study on multilingual pragmatic awareness in collaborative writing. Some researchers have argued for a multilingual view as well in the examination of language learner pragmatic awareness, pointing to the unique aspects of multilingual pragmatic comprehension and awareness found in current research. Thus, this paper examines the pragmatic awareness of multilingual learners while they complete a collaborative writing task in three languages, namely, Catalan, Spanish, and English. The data consisted of 30 university students' oral interaction audio recordings while working in pairs to produce three different email request message drafts. Pragmatic-related episodes were identified using both Brown and Levinson's politeness features and Leech's approach to pragmatic competence, to provide a comprehensive portrayal of the learner's performance. Findings support prior research with multilingual learners of English and provide insight into the mechanisms that multilingual students employ when producing pragmatic production in collaborative writing tasks.Bardovi-Harlig (2017) examined pragmatic awareness in second language learning. Pragmatic awareness has been incorporated into the literature on second language (L2) pragmatics. Promoting pragmatic awareness as an instructional objective offers advantages over identifying pragmatic targets for learners themselves, such as allowing learners to make informed decisions about pursuing L2 pragmatics. The literature concerning pragmatic awareness can be categorized into certain areas: Pedagogical papers, Tests of Awareness, and Instructional Effect Studies. Pedagogical papers represent operationalized awareness based on Schmidt’s Noticing Hypothesis. Developmental studies of awareness are concerned with testing the claims made by the Noticing. The other category includes instructional effect studies, which combine pedagogical operationalization of awareness with either test of awareness and language production pre- and post-instruction.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study aimed to determine whether improving learners' pragmatic knowledge specifically in relation to indirect speech acts will increase their writing abilities in a second language (L2) at the University of Misan. This study employed a quantitative approach. Kas et al. (2019) state that quantitative approaches often involve collecting and analyzing numbers to identify patterns and determine if there is a relationship between variables. It also used an achievement test, experiments, and statistical analyses to ensure both accuracy and reliability. The multiple-choice questions were developed around themes of using pragmatic awareness in enhancing second English language writing skill. These questions also include problem-solving through English language, and fundamental language skills (acquiring reading skill, grammar, vocabulary, etc.).

3.2 Data Collection Methods, Data Analysis, and Research Tool

After building and judging the achievement test, it was distributed to the participants who were randomly chosen from the English language college in the University of Misan in Iraq. This test was directly distributed to the participants by their English assistant professor to examine their pre-test to be sure that all the participants have the same level in English language. The achievement test consisted of 18 questions (See Appendix A). The aim of conducting this pre-test was to be sure that they have nearly the same level in acquiring the English language. The researcher asked 2 English language teachers to teach the 2 groups. The first teacher used pragmatic awareness materials in teaching the students of the experimental group, while the second English language instructor used traditional methods in teaching the students of the same materials. After 3 weeks of teaching the participants the materials, they were asked to answer the same questions on the achievement test as a post-test. The participants' responses for the two groups in their post-test are stated in appendices D and E. Their responses are collected and studied carefully by the researcher. Then, their answers are analyzed statistically by using the SPSS program. The required tests were used to elicit the final results of this study.After judging this achievement test by a set of assistant and associated professors, the 2 groups were asked to answer its 18 questions as a pre-test (See their scores in Appendices B and C). Beyond content-related validation through expert opinions, the researcher assessed the tool's internal consistency using a reliability assessment. He achieved this through calculating Cronbach's Alpha coefficients for the whole tool as well as its sub-questions. The results showed that the tool had a high level of reliability, ranging from "excellent" to "perfect", with all Cronbach's Alpha coefficients exceeding 0.82, which demonstrated the consistent measurement of the same construct for each of the tool's individual items. In addition to providing qualitative evidence of the tool's reliability, this also demonstrated the strength of our data collection method. An exploratory factor analysis was conducted to establish the underlying structural element of the size. Following this, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to evaluate whether or not the proposed model fit the data collected. The two analyses were used to test the construct validity and dimensionality of the tool for measuring the role of pragmatic awareness in enhancing second English language writing skill. Ninety-four (94) students took the achievement test and answered the achievement test questions. Their answers were then analyzed statistically.

Pre-Test

A pre-test was conducted to be sure that all the participants' ability in English language have the same level. A pre-test was conducted for the two groups (control and experimental). Their scores are stated in Appendices B and C.:

Table 1. Pre-test for both groups (control and experimental)

Pre-Test	**No. of**	**Range**	**Minimum**	**Maximum**	**Mean**		**Std. Deviation**
	Partici-pants	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic
Control Group	47	68.00	12.00	80.00	39.8723	2.76720	18.97094
Experimental Group	47	62.00	18.00	80.00	48.5957	3.06130	20.98722
Total	94						

Table (1) showed that the average scores of the control and experimental groups are 68.00 % and 62.00 %. Besides, the average mean of the control group is 39.87, while the average mean of the experimental group is 48.60 %. It means the scores of both groups are nearly near each other, and both groups nearly have the same level in the field of acquiring English language. Thus, this sample is considered valid to participate in this educational experiment.

Post-test

After building and validating the achievement test (See Appendix A) by the researcher, it was distributed to the participants of the control and experimental groups (94 participants). This test included 18 questions, and it was judged by a set of assistant and associated professors who are specialized in the same major and by examining the participants in a pre-test as stated in the above-mentioned table (1).

3.3 Population and Sample

The population of this study includes all students who are currently studying English language skills at the University of Misan in Iraq. The sample consisted of 94 university students who are studying English language

at this university. It is divided into 2 groups (Control and experimental groups). The number in each group is 47 participants (27 females and 20 males). The duration of teaching university students is 3 weeks, and their age is between 19 and 25.

Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of the Participant Sample of the two groups

Characteristic	Category/Range	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
No. of Participants	94	94	100.0 %
Gender	Females	54	55.5 %
	Males	40	44.5 %
Learning Level	1– 6 years	94	100.0 %
Academic Qualification and Place	Students at the University of Misan	94	100.0 %
Age	Between 19 and 25 years	94	100.0 %

4. Research Results

The research question is: To what context does an increase in the pragmatic awareness that learners have about indirect speech acts enhance their Second Language (L2) Writing Skills?To find out the answer of this research question, a post-test is conducted for the control and experimental groups. Appendices D and E show the participants' scores of the 2 groups to the achievement test. The following table (3) clarifies the participant's results:**Table 3.** Post-test for both groups (control and experimental)

Post-test	No. of partici-pants	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean		Std. Deviation
						Std. Error	
Control Group	47	71.00	23.00	94.00	55.1277	2.20977	15.14943
Experimental Group	47	66.00	33.00	99.00	71.5532	2.09969	14.39476
Total	94						

Table 3 showed the comparison between the final results between the 2 groups (Control and experimental) and their final scores that are stated in appendices D and E. The above-mentioned table showed that the average mean of the control group is 55.12, while the average mean of the experimental group is 71.55. It means there is a positive and significant difference for the experimental group. They got higher scores than the participants of the control group in the field of acquiring the English language after teaching both groups for 3 weeks. Thus, students who received instruction intended to help them develop pragmatic awareness of indirect speech acts performed better than students who did not receive this instruction on a second language writing assessment.

5. Discussion

A study from the University of Misan demonstrated that explicit teaching of pragmatic awareness for indirect speech acts results in significant improvement in student L2 writing, due to students becoming better able to produce language appropriate to the situation. This research supports the findings of Abdulateef and Ali's (2023) research on Iraqi EFL learners, demonstrating an increase in pragmatic competence due to learners' increased awareness of speech acts, politeness strategies, and Gricean maxims. As Yousif Abdulateef and Najim Abd Ali (2023) indicate, while L2 pragmatics can develop without specific instruction or training, it does so when students are provided with direct instruction and practice regarding the use of indirectness and appropriateness; and students receiving formal instruction on the topics outperform those receiving only grammar-based instruction. Taguchi (2019) has also supported these claims as he has shown that providing students with instruction in speech acts increases their ability to complete communicative tasks in writing and interactions; therefore, creating a link between form and function in communication.This study outcome relates directly to Austin's Speech Act Theory as he has shown us that the use of language is both for the purpose of

delivering information and for taking action by means of the utterance itself; thus, the focus on indirect speech acts within the instruction provided to students demonstrates Searle's extension of Austin's work, specifically that the illocutionary force (the intended meaning) does not match the literal form of the utterance and therefore requires an understanding of pragmatics in order to be able to interpret it appropriately or produce it appropriately. Therefore, the results from the L2 writing performance of students at the University of Misan show how direct teaching of pragmatics can prepare students to effectively communicate the illocutionary, locutionary, and perlocutionary aspects of communication thereby increasing the effectiveness and relevance of their writing.The study conducted by the University of Misan provides additional evidence that developing a student's pragmatic abilities will enhance their overall communicative competencies and written performance. Therefore, there exists a strong argument to include pragmatics within the curriculum of second-language learning.

5.1 Study Implications

The implications of this study highlight how important it is for language teaching to include instruction on pragmatics in second language (L2) curricula because knowledge about indirect speech acts is associated with better writing than grammar alone in second language (L2) learners. It also adds to speech act theory in applied linguistics by indicating that awareness of pragmatics has a positive impact on the ability to be effective in communicating through academic writing.

5.2 Study Limitations

The findings from this study are limited to the University of Misan context which limits the generalizability of results to other cultures and education systems. The study only investigated the pragmatic feature of indirect speech acts in written communication, and did not investigate other pragmatic features such as conversational strategy or intercultural communication.

5.3 Recommendations for Future Studies

The future studies will need to validate if there is an association between instructional content related to pragmatics and improved L2 writing in a variety of learner populations by examining different contexts and larger samples. Researchers are also recommended to investigate the effects of other pragmatic aspects (such as politeness strategies and discourse markers) and how they affect the ability to write and speak in both English and the target language.

6. Conclusion

This study confirms that instructional emphasis on learner's awareness of the pragmatic aspects of indirect speech acts will have a positive effect on learner's writing performance in the second language (L2) by providing for more contextual appropriateness and communicative effectiveness in their written output. This study indicates that writing proficiency is based upon much more than simply grammar and vocabulary; it also relies upon the learner's ability to determine and manipulate the illocutionary force and the social meanings inherent in language. Additionally, the results support the application of speech act theory and the inclusion of pragmatic instruction in language teaching programs because learners can be helped through understanding how indirectness operates in actual communication. Finally, the study provides evidence that there is an educational need for pragmatics-based instructional strategies in higher education, especially at institutions such as the University of Misan, which require students to utilize both linguistics and pragmatics to be successful in communicating.

References:

1. Abdulateef, R. Y., & Ali, H. N. A. (2023). Pragmatic Awareness of Speech Acts, Politeness, and Grice Maxims of Iraqi EFL Postgraduate Students. Arab World English Journal, 14(1).
2. Abdulrahman, B. S. (2012). Effects and implications of pragmatic competence for enhancing EFL university students written performance. Author House.
3. Austin, J. L. (1975). How to do things with words. Harvard university press.
4. Ashraf, M., & Ali, S. (2021). Pragmatic competence: difficulties faced by Pakistani EFL learners. sjesr, 4(2), 444-451.
5. Azam, S., & Saleem, T. (2018). Teaching pragmatic competence in Pakistani context: A case of Pakistani EFL learners compliment responses. Erevna Journal of Linguistics and Literature, 2(2), 27-49.
6. Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2017). Pragmatic awareness in second language acquisition. In The Routledge handbook of language awareness (pp. 323-338). Routledge.

7. Eslami-Rasekh, Z. (2005). Raising the pragmatic awareness of language learners. ELT journal, 59(3), 199-208.
8. House, J., & Kádár, D. Z. (2025). Speech acts and interaction in second language pragmatics: A position paper. Language Teaching, 58(3), 396-407.
9. Karpava, S. (2025). The Effect of L1 Linguistic and Cultural Background on L2 Pragmatic Competence. Languages, 10(5), 112.
10. Kas, M. J., Penninx, B., Sommer, B., Serretti, A., Arango, C., & Marston, H. (2019). A quantitative approach to neuropsychiatry: the why and the how. Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews, 97, 3-9.
11. Korkmaz, S., & Karatepe, Ç. (2023). Exploring the pragmatic awareness and competence of EFL instructors at tertiary level. Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International, 13(1), 34-55.
12. Martinez-Buffa, I., & Safont, P. (2023). Multilingual pragmatic awareness in collaborative writing. Language awareness, 32(3), 421-442.
13. Martínez-Flor, A., & Soler, E. A. (2007). Developing pragmatic awareness of suggestions in the EFL classroom: A focus on instructional effects. Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10(1), 47-76.
14. Rafiq, R., & Yavuz, M. A. (2024). Advancing English as second language communication: The effectiveness of online pragmatic training on essential speech acts. Heliyon, 10(11).
15. Sanchez-Hernandez, A., & Martinez-Flor, A. (2022). Teaching the pragmatics of English as an international language: A focus on pragmatic markers. Language Teaching Research, 26(2), 256-278.
16. Savvidou, C., & Economidou-Kogetsidis, M. (2019). Teaching pragmatics: Nonnative-speaker teachers' knowledge, beliefs and reported practices. Intercultural Communication Education, 2(1), 39-58.
17. Su, Y. (2021). Accepting invitations and offers in second language Chinese: Effect of proficiency on pragmatic competence in interaction. Journal of Pragmatics, 180, 131-149.
18. Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge University.
19. Taguchi, N. (2019). Second language acquisition and pragmatics: An overview. The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition and pragmatics, 1-14.
20. Xin, Z. H. U. A. N. G. (2007). From communicative competence to communicative language teaching. Sino-US English Teaching, 4(9), 39-45.
21. Yousif Abdulateef, R., & Najim Abd Ali, H. (2023). Pragmatic Awareness of Speech Acts, Politeness, and Grice Maxims of Iraqi EFL Postgraduate Students. Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Volume, 14.

Appendix A

Achievement Test

Dear students at the English Language College at the University of Misan

Could you read the questions of this achievement test and then answer them carefully?

……

This achievement test is divided into 3 parameters: conceptual understanding, identification of indirect speech Acts, and application in L2 writing.

A-Conceptual understanding (6 questions)

1. Pragmatic awareness in L2 writing mainly consists of:

A. Grammatical knowledge
B. Language usage appropriate to the situation
C. Vocabulary list memorization
D. Idea literal translation

2. What is the difference between indirect speech acts and direct speech acts?

A. Directly conveys the meaning
B. Uses implied meaning
C. Always uses complex grammar
D. Ungrammatical form

3. What is an example of an indirect request?

A. “Close the window.”
B. “Can you possibly close the window?”
C. “The window has been closed.”
D. “I will close the window.”

4. Why are indirect speech acts important to L2 writers?

A. Improve spelling accuracy
B. Enhance politeness and appropriateness
C. Reduce the number of words written
D. Replace grammatical rules.

5. A writer writes "it's cold in here," with the intention that he or she wants the reader to close the window; what type of speech act is this?

A. Vocabulary extension
B. Pragmatic transfer
C. Use of an indirect speech act
D. Syntactical awareness

6. When does pragmatic failure occur in L2 writing?

A. When writers use too many adjectives
B. When writers fail to understand indirect meanings
C. When writers avoid complex sentences
D. When writers memorize idioms.

B-Identification of Indirect Speech Acts (6 questions)

7. What sentence functions as an indirect refusal?

A. "No, I won't go."
B. "I'm not certain I can make it."
C. "I will attend."
D. "Yes, I'll be there."

8. When a teacher asks "do you have a pen?" in the classroom, it is most likely:

A. A question about ownership of something.
B. An indirect request for a pen
C. A grammar lesson.
D. A rhetorical question.

9. When a speaker says "it's getting late" during a conversation, he/she is probably implying:

A. A statement of fact.
B. A suggestion to leave
C. A complaint about time.
D. Weather forecast.

10. What is an example of an indirect offer?

A. "I'll help you."
B. "Will you let me help you?"
C. "You should do it by yourself."
D. "I can't help you."

11. "I wonder if you might explain this once again" can be classified as:

A. A direct order.
B. An indirect request
C. A refusal.
D. A complaint.

12. "When I say 'I am afraid I don't have time now,'" it functions as:

A. A direct refusal.
B. An indirect refusal
C. A request.
D. A suggestion.

C-Application in L2 Writing (6 questions)

13. Using indirect speech acts in academic writing will help students:

A. Avoid plagiarism.
B. Politely express their disagreement
C. Write shorter essays.
D. Increase their vocabulary.

14. Which of the following is an example of pragmatic awareness in providing written feedback on writing?

A. "Your essay is terrible."
B. "Maybe you can clarify your position."
C. "Write all over again."
D. "That was incorrect."

15. A student writes "I'm unsure whether this approach works well." What is an example of?

A. Direct criticism.
B. Indirect criticism
C. Correction of grammar.
D. Expansion of vocabulary.

16. When writing a business e-mail, "I would greatly appreciate it if you could send the report" is an example of:

A. A direct order.
B. An indirect request
C. A refusal.
D. A complaint

17. What is an example of improved L2 writing skills through increased awareness of pragmatics?

A. "Give me the data now."
B. "If it is okay, could you give me the data when you have a chance?"
C. "The data is needed."
D. "Send the data."

18. Learners who write indirectly will be more likely to:

A. Be seen as polite and competent
B. Write longer essays.
C. Have fewer grammar errors.
D. Better remember idioms.

Appendix B

Pre- test for the participants' scores of the control group

No. of participants		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	12	2	1.5	4.3	4.3
	18	1	.8	2.1	6.4
	22	1	.8	2.1	8.5
	23	2	1.5	4.3	12.8
	24	1	.8	2.1	14.9
	25	6	4.5	12.8	27.7
	26	5	3.8	10.6	38.3
	32	1	.8	2.1	40.4
	33	2	1.5	4.3	44.7
	34	4	3.0	8.5	53.2
	36	4	3.0	8.5	61.7
	38	2	1.5	4.3	66.0
	45	1	.8	2.1	68.1
	46	1	.8	2.1	70.2
	50	3	2.3	6.4	76.6
	60	2	1.5	4.3	80.9
	61	1	.8	2.1	83.0
	63	1	.8	2.1	85.1
	67	2	1.5	4.3	89.4
	72	1	.8	2.1	91.5
	75	1	.8	2.1	93.6

	80	3	2.3	6.4	100.0
	Total	47	35.3	100.0	
	Total	133	100.0		

Appendix C

Pre- test for the participants' scores of the experimental group

NO. of partici-pants		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18	4	3.0	8.5	8.5
	22	4	3.0	8.5	17.0
	26	5	3.8	10.6	27.7
	28	1	.8	2.1	29.8
	32	2	1.5	4.3	34.0
	37	1	.8	2.1	36.2
	44	2	1.5	4.3	40.4
	45	3	2.3	6.4	46.8
	46	3	2.3	6.4	53.2
	55	1	.8	2.1	55.3
	58	1	.8	2.1	57.4
	61	4	3.0	8.5	66.0
	63	3	2.3	6.4	72.3
	65	2	1.5	4.3	76.6
	67	1	.8	2.1	78.7
	72	3	2.3	6.4	85.1
	75	3	2.3	6.4	91.5
	80	4	3.0	8.5	100.0
	Total	47	35.3	100.0	
Total	133	100.0			

Appendix D

Post- test for the participants' scores of the control group

No. of partici pants		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	25	1	.8	2.1	2.1
	33	1	.8	2.1	4.3
	34	2	1.5	4.3	8.5
	36	1	.8	2.1	10.6
	38	2	1.5	4.3	14.9
	45	1	.8	2.1	17.0
	46	1	.8	2.1	19.1
	49	4	3.0	8.5	27.7
	50	3	2.3	6.4	34.0
	55	3	2.3	6.4	40.4
	56	7	5.3	14.9	55.3
	57	3	2.3	6.4	61.7
	59	1	.8	2.1	63.8
	60	1	.8	2.1	66.0
	66	1	.8	2.1	68.1
	67	6	4.5	12.8	80.9
	70	1	.8	2.1	83.0
	76	1	.8	2.1	85.1

	77	1	.8	2.1	87.2
	78	2	1.5	4.3	91.5
	80	1	.8	2.1	93.6
	83	2	1.5	4.3	97.9
	94	1	.8	2.1	100.0
	Total	47	35.3	100.0	
Total	133	100.0			

Appendix E

Post-test for the participants' scores of the experimental group

No. of partici-pants		**Frequency**	**Percent**	**Valid Percent**	**Cumulative Percent**
Valid	18	4	3.0	8.5	8.5
	22	4	3.0	8.5	17.0
	26	5	3.8	10.6	27.7
	28	1	.8	2.1	29.8
	32	2	1.5	4.3	34.0
	37	1	.8	2.1	36.2
	44	2	1.5	4.3	40.4
	45	3	2.3	6.4	46.8
	46	3	2.3	6.4	53.2
	55	1	.8	2.1	55.3
	58	1	.8	2.1	57.4
	61	4	3.0	8.5	66.0
	63	3	2.3	6.4	72.3
	65	2	1.5	4.3	76.6
	67	1	.8	2.1	78.7
	72	3	2.3	6.4	85.1
	75	3	2.3	6.4	91.5
	80	4	3.0	8.5	100.0
	Total	47	35.3	100.0	