

Journal of English Language
Teaching and Learning
No. 11, 2013

Pragmatics Effect on English Writing Ability among High School Students

Esmail Faghih

Professor, South Tehran Islamic Azad University

Mohammad Javad Ansari

MA in TEFL

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to find a practical solution for improving writing skill among Iranian high school learners of EFL. The main question was whether pragmatics had any priority over traditional methods in improving writing or not. Forty high school students were selected on the basis of their performance in PET (2009). In addition the following instruments were also used in this quasi-experimental research: California Standard Test (2008), Writing Discourse Completion Task, and Discourse Self-Assessment Task. The special treatment of the experimental group on the role of pragmatics lasted for about ten weeks, while the control group received only the traditional instruction on writing. The results show that there is a meaningful relationship between the pragmatic competency and the improvement of the EFL learners' writing skill. Paired t-test was utilized for analyzing the data. The study concludes that the teachers can use insights from pragmatics to teach writing skill appropriately and by improving writing skill through pragmatics, EFL learners will be able to communicate in a more appropriate way.

Keywords: pragmatics, writing, traditional methods, product, process

تاریخ وصول: ۹۲/۳/۱۶، تاریخ تصویب: ۹۲/۵/۳۰

*-E-mail: mohammadjavad57@gmail.com

Introduction

In TEFL it is crucial to find conducive ways to improve EFL learners' ability in writing in order to get better results from teaching practices. This is especially true in the Iranian TEFL context because although majority of the EFL teachers in the public schools and private institutes try to help their students to improve their writing skill, their students never reach to the satisfactory levels and the objectives that were assigned by teachers. Unfortunately, most of our high school graduates, even if they pass the University Entrance Examination, cannot write even simple texts. The present study which is concerned about the writing ability among Iranian high school students of EFL seeks to find an applicable solution for improving this skill. It is hoped that by utilizing the findings of the present study - utilizing pragmatics to improve the writing ability of Iranian EFL learners- students will be able to overcome this problem and consequently they will be able to write appropriate simple texts in English.

Theoretical Background

Teaching writing and specially providing feedback to students' writings is time-consuming and teachers should spend more energy to teach it than the other skills. In addition, speaking is usually considered superior to other skills and the writing skill does not receive the due attention. Let us briefly look at some authors' ideas about writing skill.

Writing. Reppen (2002) introduces a new way of teaching writing which is genre-based approach and he has conducted a research on the basis of this new approach. The results of his research revealed that:

1. Students were enthusiastic about this approach.
 2. Students had a strong desire to turn any task into a story.
- Consequently he believes that this approach – genre-based approach- may offer ESL learners' valuable practices in various school-valued ways of writing.

The other main point in considering writing is that whether writing should receive the main attention as a kind of product or process approach. Product is the end aim of teaching writing but the process

plays more important role in teaching writing. In teaching of writing, the teachers can focus on both the product and the process of the writing. Harmer (2001, p.257) frames this observation in this way that, "When concentrating on the product we are only interested in the aim of a task and in the end product. Those who advocate a process approach to writing, however, pay attention to various stages that any piece of writing goes through." In process approach, on the other hand, the various stages of writing are fundamental. Harmer further mentions that, "By spending time with learners on pre-writing phases, editing, redrafting, and finally 'publishing' their work, a process approach aims to get to the heart of the various skills that should be employed when writing" (p. 257).

Brown (2001) also makes a distinction between process and product approaches. By product approach he means that compositions are supposed to "(a) meet certain standards of prescribed English rhetorical style, (b) reflect accurate grammar, and (c) be organized in conformity with what the audience would consider to be conventional" (p.335). Therefore, he summarizes that "the process approach is an attempt to take advantage of the nature of the written code (unlike conversation, it can be planned and given an unlimited number of revisions before its 'release') to give students a chance to think as they write" (p.336). Creating balance between process and product is ideal because the product, after all, is the ultimate goal. As he puts it the "process is not the end; it is the means to the end" (p.337).

Silva and Matsuda (2002) have stated that dissatisfaction with controlled composition and paragraph-pattern approach paved the way for the process approach. This trend views the writing as a complex, recursive, and creative process. The writer is engaged in the discovery and expression of meaning; the reader, on interpreting that intended meaning. In this process, they believe that it is up to the writer to recognize a task and an audience to make the response to needs of the audience.

Hedgcock (2005, pp. 604-605) identifies core characteristics of process-oriented pedagogies. The following features distinguish the process-oriented writing:

- Discovery learning,
- Free writing, journaling and private writing activities,
- Localization of writing processes and text in authentic contexts,
- Modeling and monitoring of invention, prewriting, and revision strategies,
- Recursive practices,
- Formative feedback from real readers, and
- Provision of meaningful content for writing tasks.

In addition, Leki (2002) outlines the most significant characteristics of process-based orientations as:

1. The proficient L2 writers focused on content, besides form.
2. The L2 writers need to reach a threshold level of proficiency in L2 before they engage in writing they use in L1.
3. The writers' processes vary fairly across individuals.
4. Shifting to L1 can be a useful strategy for generating ideas and stimulating more sophisticated thinking in L2.

In teaching writing and various approaches different activities are applied ranging from more controlled compositions to more free compositions or creative writings. Accordingly, Ferreira and Lantolf (2008) have suggested a detailed teaching approach to writing based on the *Movement from the Abstract to the Concrete (MAC)* and *Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL)*. They conclude that there is no direct connection between the theoretical thinking and the writing improvement.

Pragmatics. Pragmatics is the study of the context-dependent aspect of meaning which is systematically abstracted away from the construction of logical form. The pragmatic concept was used by Morris (1938) to indicate the relationship of signs to interpreters. On the other hand, Aitchison (1992, p. 93) has defined it as "the branch of linguistics which studies those aspects of meaning which can be captured by semantic theory". Additionally, Richards, Platt, and Platt (1992, pp.284-285) have elaborated on the definition of pragmatics and state that:

[Pragmatics] is the study of the use of language in communication, particularly the relationships between sentences and the context and situations in which they are used. Pragmatics includes the study of:

- (a) how the interpretation and the use of utterances depend on knowledge of the real world;
- (b) how speakers use and understand speech acts; and
- (c) how the structures of sentences is influenced by the relationship between the speaker and hearer.

Additionally, McDonough (2002, p. 51) defines the pragmatics as follows:

[Pragmatics is] the study of the ways in which people

1. Disambiguate meaning in context;
2. Assign complete meaning;
3. Distinguish sentence from speaker meaning;
4. Act in speech in the way they do.

Baker and Hengeveld (2012, p. 25) believe that “the way language use is organized in interaction and in longer texts” is called pragmatics.

Put briefly, by means of pragmatics, one inevitably seeks what the speaker or writer has in his/her mind. There is no need to labor the point that by shared knowledge (i.e., pre-existing knowledge) everyone can interpret the unwritten and the unsaid intentions.

Pragmatics is an instance of language use which can be classified based on various factors such as grammatical and lexical choices and their distribution in main versus supportive materials, theme, style, and the framework of knowledge and expectations within which addressee interprets the discourse. Basically, pragmatics has been classified into five categories: deixis, conversational implicatures, conventional implicatures, presuppositions, and speech acts.

Various studies have been conducted by researchers on pragmatics and interesting results were presented. Bardovi-Harlig (2002) has talked about the pragmatics. She believed that the study of L2 pragmatics has come to be known as 'interlanguage

pragmatics' (ILP), that is to say, "it is the study of L2 pragmatics" (p.183).

According to Spencer-Oatey and Žegarac (2002), 'cognitive psychological approach' and 'social-psychological approach' are two broad approaches to pragmatics. Meanwhile, they believe that these two approaches should be seen as complementary.

Finally, Rose and Kasper (2001) believe that in order to investigate how the learning of L2 pragmatics is shaped by instructional content and activities, we have to consider the following questions:

1. What opportunities for improving L2 pragmatics ability are offered in language classroom?
2. Whether pragmatic ability improves in a classroom setting without instruction in pragmatics? and
3. What effect various approaches to instruction have on pragmatic improvement.

In their interventional research, Kasper and Rover (2005) examine the pragmatics teachability and the instruction effectiveness for teaching it. Their results show that pragmatic features are indeed teachable and the instruction effectiveness was apparent. They elaborate on it in this way that:

Effective-of-instruction research has apparently been viewed as most compatible with psycholinguistic theory and (quasi-, pre-) experimental design; however, interventional research on instruction in pragmatics could also be conducted under a social practice theory and engage different qualitative methodologies, including participatory methods such as action research. (p. 324).

Present Study

This study intends to find any possible relationship between pragmatics and writing skill. We have tried to improve the writing skill of Iranian high school students of EFL by elaborating pragmatics. In order to teach writing by means of pragmatics, the teachers must have knowledge about the pragmatics and its sub-categories. By integrating pragmatics into writing skill teaching, we want to evaluate

its benefits for the improvement of writing skill. For instance, whether the students taught by means of pragmatics will be aware of the interactional norms more than those taught by traditional methods. Another aim of the present study was to find out whether those taught by means of pragmatics will evaluate their writing better than those taught by traditional methods.

Particularly, by using pragmatics, this study tries to improve learners' ability in writing in English and it shows that there is a significant difference between using traditional methods in teaching writing and this method – i.e., pragmatics in teaching writing.

Research Questions

The following research questions were addressed in this study:

1. Does teaching writing by means of pragmatics have any significant advantage over the traditional methods in improving the writing ability of Iranian high school learners of EFL?
2. Does teaching writing by means of pragmatics have any significant advantage over the traditional methods in improving the paraphrasing ability of Iranian high school learners of EFL?

Methodology

The current investigation proceeded in different stages. First, the participants were selected on the basis of their performance in Preliminary English Test (2009) and the homogeneous students were divided into two groups: the experimental and the control group. Then the control group received the traditional method and the experimental group received the new treatment.

Participants

The participants of this study consisted of 40 male students of high school living in the city of Qom in south of Tehran. They had four years of instruction of EFL. In each academic year, these learners studied English in two semesters and these two semesters consisted of twenty-four sessions and each session was held once a week. They

were taught mainly grammar and vocabulary and teaching writing was somehow neglected and therefore it did not receive the due attention and appropriate instruction. The students represented a typical EFL population with limited exposure to the TARGET LANGUAGE outside of the classroom context. The students who took part in this research were of an age range of 16-20 and they were in grade two. Those high school students who scored +3SD above the mean were selected. These participants were then randomly divided into two groups: the experimental group and the control group.

Instruments

In order to carry out this study the following instruments were used:

1. A recent version of the standardized tests of Preliminary English Test (PET) (2009) was used in order to make sure of the participants' homogeneity in proficiency in EFL. The total score in this test was 60 and for the sake of convenience this score was converted to 0-20. It consisted of two sections of reading and writing.

2. California Standards Test (CST) (2008) was used for pretests and posttests. According to the scoring guidelines of this test the learners' writing and paraphrasing were evaluated in the areas such as organization and focus, sentence structure and conventions. The scoring guidelines of CST were as follows: to demonstrate a clear understanding of purpose; to maintain a consistent point of view, focus, and organizational structure; to include sentence variety; and to contain some errors of the English language such as grammar, punctuation, capitalization and spelling. In the writing CST scores were from 0 to 4, but for convenience of this investigation this range was converted to 0 to 20.

3. Written Discourse Completion Task (WDCT). By means of this task, the EFL learners were given topics and then they were expected to write about these topics and explain whatever they know about them.

4. Discourse Self- Assessment Task (DSAT). This instrument gave a chance to participants to score and evaluate their own writings.

It should be mentioned that as observed by Brown (2001, pp. 301-302) originally, WDCT and DSAT, which he calls them instruments, are used for evaluating pragmatics, but they can also be used in teaching writing.

Procedures

In order to investigate possible differences between traditional methods of teaching English and the teaching of pragmatics which was utilized in this study, the experimental group received the special treatment in pragmatics. In order to collect data, the following steps were taken.

The forty homogenous participants were required to perform two tasks as follows:

a) *To write a composition.* In this stage, for pretest, they were given about one specific topic as the pretest. It required that students' writing contain 50-100 words and these were assessed according to CST scoring guidelines. At the end of treatment, again both the control and experimental groups were required to write about the following topic for posttest: *Describe your daily life* and CST was run for both groups. In each session these students had to write about one specific topic such as:

My Family; If I were an English teacher, I would ...

b) *To paraphrase.* At this stage, the participants were asked to paraphrase one text which was about familiar topics and from their books and this was accounted for their pretest (Appendix A). Again, for the posttest, these two groups were required to paraphrase one of texts which adopted from their English books (Appendix B).

The experimental group received the treatment by applying Written Discourse Completion Task (WDCT) and Discourse Self-Assessment Task (DSAT) whereas the control group was taught by the traditional methods and never received the new treatment

The treatment of the study lasted for about ten weeks and in every week one session of about 45-60 minutes was held. Finally, the results of the performance of each group were compared both with the other group and with the results of pretest of the same group, i.e. in-group

and between-group comparisons which will be discussed in the following sections. These comparisons showed that there was a significant difference between the performance of the control group and the experimental group before and after the treatment.

Results

The data collected for this study was analyzed quantitatively. Paired t-test was run as the appropriate statistical test. Paired t-test was required to examine whether teaching pragmatics enhances the writing of the experimental group. Paired t-test determined the difference between the performance of the control and experimental groups.

First Question

Does teaching writing by means of pragmatics have any significant advantage over the traditional methods in improving the writing ability of Iranian high school learners of EFL?

In order to answer the first question, the scores of the control and experimental groups in pretest and posttest in writing were obtained. Below, first the in-group comparisons of the control and experimental groups will be illustrated and then the between-group comparisons will be performed.

In-group comparisons confirmed this fact that in the control group there was no significant difference between pretest and posttest scores. On the other hand, in the experimental group the difference was significant.

The descriptive statistics of pretest and posttest for the control group in writing are displayed in tables 1 and 2, respectively:

Table 1: *Pretest Descriptive Statistics for the Control Group in Writing*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
VAR00001	20	.00	7.00	2.2000	1.90843
Valid N (listwise)	20				

Table 2. *Posttest Descriptive Statistics for the Control Group in Writing*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
VAR00001	20	.00	5.00	1.8125	1.75446
Valid N (listwise)	20				

Table 3. *Paired Samples Test of the Control Group in Writing*

		Paired Differences						t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of Difference					
					Lower	Upper				
Pair 1	Pretest-Posttest	0.387	1.800	0.179	0.0127	0.762	2.1	19	0.043	

$\alpha < 0.05$

According to the pretest and posttest scores of the control group as displayed in table 3, a value of 2.164 with 19 d.f. at the 0.05 level was not significant because in critical t values, at the 0.05 level with 19 d.f. the value is 2.093. Note also the two-tailed probability. This category means that there existed a two-tailed test and because the value of α , 0.05, did not exceed this value, 0.43. Therefore, it can be said that the traditional methods in teaching writing were not effective. These findings support the claims that traditional methods did not have any significant effect on EFL learners' writing ability.

The descriptive statistics of pretest and posttest for the experimental group in writing is displayed in tables 4 and 5, respectively:

Table 4. *Pretest Descriptive Statistics for the Experimental Group in Writing*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
VAR00001	20	.00	10.00	4.1500	3.04830
Valid N (listwise)	20				

Table 5. *Posttest Descriptive Statistics for the Experimental Group in Writing*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
VAR00001	20	9.00	18.00	14.6000	2.68328
Valid N (listwise)	20				

Table 6. *Paired Samples Test of the Experimental Group in Writing*

		Paired Differences							
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
					Lower	Upper			
z	Pretest-Posttest	-1.04	2.625	0.587	-11.67	-9.221	-17.80	19	0.000

$\alpha < 0.05$

Based on the table 6, a value of -17.8 with 19 d.f. at the 0.05 level was significant because in critical t values, at the 0.05 level with 19 d.f. the value is 2.093. This displays that there was a significant difference between the pretest and the posttest scores of the experimental group. Therefore, it can be said that the new treatment in teaching writing was effective. That is, there exists evidence to support the claims that the pragmatic competency had significant impact on EFL learners' writing.

In the next step between-group comparisons were made. In this stage, the posttests scores of the control and experimental groups are compared. The posttest scores of the control and experimental groups are as follows:

Table 7. Paired Samples Test of the Control and Experimental Groups in writing

		Paired Differences						df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of Difference		t		
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Control-Experimental	-1.27	3.076	0.687	-14.22	-11.34	-18.59	19	0.000

$\alpha < 0.05$

Based on table 7, a value of -18.59 with 19 d.f. at the 0.05 level was significant because in critical t values, at the 0.05 level with 19 d.f. the value is 2.093. This confirms that there was a significant difference between the control and experimental groups.

It is worth nothing that the two-tailed probability was zero and it verified that the pragmatic competency had a significant effect on the writing ability of EFL learners. Therefore, according to these results, we reject the first null hypothesis and say that:

Teaching writing by means of pragmatics has significant advantage over the traditional methods in improving the writing ability of Iranian high school learners of EFL.

Second Question

Does teaching writing by means of pragmatics have any significant advantage over the traditional methods in improving the paraphrasing ability of Iranian high school learners of EFL?

In-group comparisons illustrate this fact that in the control group there is no significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores. But in the experimental group this difference is significant.

The descriptive statistics of pretest and posttest for the control group in paraphrasing is displayed in table 8 and 9, respectively:

Table 8. *Pretest Descriptive Statistics for the Control Group in Paraphrasing*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
VAR00001	20	.00	2.25	.4375	.68285
Valid N (listwise)	20				

Table 9. *Posttest Descriptive Statistics for the Control Group in Paraphrasing*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
VAR00001	20	.00	4.00	.4500	.93752
Valid N (listwise)	20				

Table 10. *Paired Samples Test of Paraphrasing by the Control Group*

		Paired Differences						t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of Difference					
					Lower	Upper				
Pair 1	Pretest-Posttest	-0.16	0.624	0.139	0.454	0.129	-1.16	19	0.259	

$\alpha < 0.05$

Table 10 shows the fact that a value of -1.164 with 19 d.f. at the 0.05 level is not significant because in critical t values, at the 0.05 level with 19 d.f. the value is 2.093. This displays that there was no significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores of the control group.

The descriptive statistics of pretest and posttest for the experimental group in paraphrasing is displayed in tables 11 and 12, respectively:

Table 11. Descriptive Statistics for the Experimental Group in Paraphrasing

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
VAR00001	20	.00	10.00	3.5125	2.62387
Valid N (listwise)	20				

Table 12. Posttest Descriptive Statistics for the Experimental Group in Paraphrasing

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
VAR00001	20	5.00	15.00	9.3500	2.92494
Valid N (listwise)	20				

Table 13. Paired Samples Test of Paraphrasing by the Experimental Group

		Paired Differences						t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of Difference					
					Lower	Upper				
Pair 1	Pretest-Posttest	-5.61	2.463	0.550	-6.76	-4.45	-10.18	19	0.000	

$\alpha < 0.05$

Table 13 shows that there is a relationship between two sets of scores. Note the two-tailed probability. According to this table a value of -10.189 with 19 d.f. at the 0.05 level was significant because in critical t values, at the 0.05 level with 19 d.f. the value is 2.093.

This illustrated the fact that the pragmatic competency in paraphrasing was effective. Therefore, there exists evidence to support the claims that traditional methods do not have any significant impact on EFL learners' paraphrasing ability. On the other hand, in the experimental group, a value of -10.18 with 19 d.f. at the level of 0.05 was significant and two-tailed probability was zero. It showed that the pragmatic competency in the experimental group had positive effect on learners' ability to paraphrase the text.

Also, between-group comparison provides the additional evidence to support this fact that the pragmatic competency in teaching writing has significant advantage over the traditional methods.

Table 14. Paired Samples Test of Paraphrasing by the Control and Experimental Groups

Pair		Paired Differences						df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of Difference		t		
					Lower	Upper			
Control-Experimental		-8.75	3.170	0.708	-10.23	-7.266	-12.34	19	0.000

$\alpha < 0.05$

Table 14 shows a value of -12.342 with 19 d.f. at the 0.05 level was extremely significant because in critical t values, at the 0.05 level with 19 d.f. the value is 2.093. Again, the two-tailed probability was zero and it verified that the pragmatic competency had effectiveness on the text paraphrasing among EFL learners. So we come to conclusion that:

Teaching writing by means of pragmatics has significant advantage over the traditional methods in improving the paraphrasing ability of Iranian high school learners of EFL.

Discussion

The current study examined the effect of teaching pragmatics on the improvement of writing skill among Iranian EFL learners at high schools. The results showed that the writing ability was substantially stimulated by the pragmatic competency. Pragmatic competency in teaching writing exerts a considerable influence on the scores which the high school EFL learners have received. As shown above, in writing, there was no significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores of the control group since the control group did not receive any new treatment to improve their writing ability (i.e., they received the traditional methods), this verified this fact that the traditional methods in teaching writing do not improve the students' ability in writing. On the contrary, those who received the new

treatment could write more native-like texts and there was significant difference between their pretest scores and posttest scores. These results were based on the in-group comparisons. Additionally, between-group comparison also verified that the emphasis on pragmatic competence had significant effect on the writing ability of participants.

By the same token, regarding the paraphrasing, we can find similar situation. There was no significance difference between pretest and posttest scores of the control group. The fact that they never received any new treatment to improve their paraphrasing ability verified the observation that the traditional methods in teaching paraphrasing do not have much effect on improving students' ability in it. On the other hand, those who received the new treatment could paraphrase more native-like texts. There was a significant difference between their pretest scores and posttest scores. These results were based on the in-group comparisons. Additionally, between-group comparisons also verified this finding.

The interesting point was that when the students were asked to score their own texts by themselves, whether writing or paraphrasing, that is to say when DSAT was used, the results of the treatment group's evaluation were much nearer to the teacher's evaluation. This means that the treatment group's evaluation was more realistic than the control group's evaluation. In pretest, both the control and experimental groups rated their ability in writing higher than the teacher's evaluation. In posttests, only the control group rated their writing and paraphrasing as the same as the pretests, but the experimental group rated their writing and paraphrasing much nearer to the teacher's evaluation. This point confirms this fact that as the EFL learners become aware of different aspects of target language and produce native-like writing and, as the above results illustrated, they produced better writing and paraphrasing than the control group. These findings showed that in considering the writing task, we should not only look at the writing itself, but also at the methods which are applied in teaching writing. Overall, the higher scores in writing and paraphrasing reveal students' awareness of pragmatic issues.

Additionally, the special instructional approach, i.e. using pragmatics in writing, also seemed to increase learners' attention to

the structures and vocabulary of the target language. In the experimental group, as the EFL learners gradually became aware of different structures used in English language, they asked their teacher to explain the various structures of target language and to clarify them. Also they wanted to know more about the vocabularies and their synonyms and antonyms in order to produce better writings. In the control group this kind of behaviors were seen less because they were bound to the traditional methods and knew nothing about the pragmatics and its effect on the writing.

In sum, although there are a number of outstanding issues in writing skill, it appears that the pragmatic competency enables the learners to improve their ability to write in native-like ways and the most fundamental aspects of the writing such as opening and the main body of the paper will be improved. Based on the positive outcomes and general effectiveness of the approach used in this study, the value of pursuing this effort is evident.

Conclusion

This study sought to answer two questions. First, whether teaching writing by means of pragmatics has any significant advantage over the traditional method in improving writing ability. Second, whether teaching writing by means of pragmatics has any significant advantage over the traditional methods in improving paraphrasing ability. This study compared the traditional methods with pragmatics in teaching writing and measured the effectiveness of these methods precisely. Then, by applying paired t-test to calculate the results of the experiment, the findings reveal that pragmatics has had significant effect on the EFL learners' ability in writing. In other words, what in effect this study shows is to verify the existence of positive relationship between pragmatics and improving writing ability. Therefore, it makes sense to say that pragmatics is one of the most influential tools for teaching writing and it is up to the teachers to utilize in their teaching practices.

References

- Baker, E.A. & Hengeveld, K. (2012). *Linguistics*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2002). Pragmatics and Second Language Acquisition. In R.B. Kaplan (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 182-192). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, D. H. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (2nd edition). Longman: Pearson Education Company.
- Brown, D.J. (2001). Pragmatics Tests. In K.R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in Language Teaching* (pp. 301-325). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferreira, M.M. & Lantolf, P.J. (2008). A Concept-based Approach to Teaching Writing through Genre Analysis. In J.P. Lantolf & M.E. Poehner (Eds.), *Sociocultural Theory and the Teaching of Second Languages*. (pp. 285-312). London: Equinox
- Gass, M.S. & Selinker, L. (2008). *Second Language Acquisition* (3rd edition). New York: Routledge.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Edinburgh: Longman.
- Hedgcock, J.S. (2005). Taking Stock of Research and Pedagogy in Second Language Learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 317-334). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Association.
- Hudson, R. A. (1996). *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kasper, G. & Rover, C. (2005). Pragmatics in Second Language Learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 597- 613). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Association.

- Lantolf, J.P. & Thorne, L.S. (2006). *Sociocultural Theory and the Genesis of Second Language Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Leki, I. (2002). Pragmatics and Second Language Acquisition. In R.B. Kaplan (Ed.), *The oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 182- 192). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McDonough, S. (2002). *Applied linguistics in language education*. London: Arnold
- The new Oxford dictionary of English*, (1998). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Paulson, Ch. B., & Bruder M. N. (1976). *Teaching English as a Second Language: Techniques and Procedures*. Massachusetts: Winthrop Publishers, Inc.
- Reppen, A. (2002). A Genre-based Approach to Content Writing Instruction. In J.C. Richards & W.A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice* (pp. 3321-327). Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Richards, J. C., Platt, J., & Platt, H. (1992). *Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. Harlow: Longman.
- Rivers, W. M. (1981). *Teaching Foreign-Language Skills* (2nd edition). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Rose, K.R. & Kasper, G. (2001). *Pragmatics in Language Teaching*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Silva, T., & Matsuda, P. K. (2002). Writing. In N. Schmitt (Ed.), *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics* (pp.251-266).London: Arnold.

Appendix A

Name:..... **GOD**
Surname:.....*PRETEST (paraphrasing)*

.....
.....
Read the following text carefully and then paraphrase it in your own words.

Holland's Toy Town

Maybe you've built toy planes or cars. Maybe you've seen toy farms. In Holland there's a toy city. The buildings are small in this city. But there are lots of them. You can walk through all the streets. But it might take three hours. That's how big it is.

The town is made of little models. There are shops and farms. There are schools and churches. The toy people are very small. They're not much bigger than your thumb. The houses aren't very tall. They might come only to your waist. In a park there's a merry-go-round you could hold in your hand. There's an airport at the toy town. Its planes are the size of a child's wagon. Small boats sail on canals about a foot wide. Cars speed over highways. Trains run along tiny tracks. There's even a golden coach. It's about a foot long. Eight tiny horses pull it. At night the city is lit up. There are thousands of tiny light bulbs. They make the city glow. This city was made for girls who love dollhouses and boys who play with toy trains. And for every man and woman who remembers being a child.

Appendix B

Name:.....	GOD
Surname:.....	<i>POSTTEST (paraphrasing)</i>
.....	
.....	
Read the following text carefully and then paraphrase it in your own words.	
Washoe and the Puzzles	
Washoe is a monkey. She lives in a lab. The lab is a place where men and women study monkeys and other animals. They study the animals to find out how they learn. One day a man put a puzzle in Washoe's cage. Washoe had to take the puzzle apart. Each time she did it right, the man gave her a slice of banana. That was her reward. Washoe didn't eat the banana slices. She just put them there. The man made the puzzle harder. But Washoe soon learned how to take it apart. Then the man ran out of bananas. What's now? Would she keep on doing puzzles without a reward? Washoe looked at him. She waited. The man gave her the next puzzle. Washoe took it apart. Then she picked up a slice of banana. She put it outside the cage for the man! And so it went on. The man would give Washoe a puzzle. And she would give back a banana slice. She kept on until she had returned all the bananas. Washoe learned many new puzzles that day. And the man learned something too. He learned that some monkeys don't work puzzles only to get food. They do puzzles for the fun of it – just like you and me!	