In reference to the above issue, it is necessary that students of secondary school levels are familiar with the use of the speech acts by English teachers in classroom communication practices. To do so, they should have sufficient pragmatic knowledge, particularly the types of illocutionary acts and illocutionary forces as reflected in the utterances of the English teachers during classroom communications. Added to this, they should also gain sufficient knowledge of interpreting the implied meaning of the utterances expressed by the English teachers under the issue of the conversational implicatures. In short, students of secondary school levels are demanded to have pragmatic awareness which is believed to be fruitful to deal with classroom communication practices with their teachers. Bardovi-Harlig and Mahan-Taylor (2003) state that the pragmatic awareness facilitates students to fully participate in the English classroom communication. Failure to do this may cause learners to miss key points in what is communicated to them or make the others misunderstand what they themselves want to communicate (Thomas in Noureddine, 2007).

THE IMPORTANCE OF PRAGMATICS KNOWLEDGE

The importance of the pragmatics knowledge in English language teaching and learning has been advocated by many experts. For example, Demerezen (1991) claims that the pragmatic competence contributes to maximally acquire of the target language. He advocates that the pragmatic competence should be embedded in English language teaching on the grounds that it contributes to analyzing the use of language in context. Further, he urges that the cash value of words is not only dependent on usage but also on different registers of language such as situational settings, colloquial usage, jargons and others that heavily depend on context. Noureddine (2007) also advocates that the pragmatic issues such as speech acts, cooperative principle and the like should be explicitly presented in teaching the target language. He further states that the use of the pragmatic analysis confers pedagogical implications one of which is to provoke a sense of language awareness on the part of the students to deal with the essence of language use.

The mastery of pragmatic knowledge confers some important points to students of secondary school levels. The important points include determining communication strategies used to deal with some communicative functions such as responding to their English teachers' questions, suggestions, commands and the
there has been a long debate among SLA researchers on teaching approaches used in the instruction. This issue is particularly related to the productiveness of implicit and explicit instruction to enhance EFL learners’ pragmatic competence. Thus, this essay argues that while the implicit instruction is reasonably applicable, the explicit pragmatic instruction is more effective to facilitate EFL learners to develop their pragmatic competence. It will then put forward some useful instructional materials that can be practically used for the development of EFL learners’ pragmatic competence.

**EXPLICIT vs. IMPLICIT PRAGMATIC INSTRUCTION**

**Explicit Pragmatic Instruction**

Supporters of the explicit pragmatic instruction assert that the explicit pragmatic instruction can direct EFL learners’ attention toward the target speech act forms in order to raise their pragmatic awareness. It confirms Schmidt’s (1993) noticing hypothesis with regard to promote learning pragmatic aspects by making the learners notice the focus of forms. Additionally, research has revealed that some pragmatic aspects cannot be automatically acquired by the learners until learners’ focus are drawn to the pragmatic instruction (Alcon, 2005; Martinez-Flor & Alcon, 2007; Gholamia, & Aghaib, 2012). One of the pragmatic aspects, for example, is related to politeness strategies in request acts. The learners not only receive metapragmatic information by providing the description of speech act of request forms, but they will also get some explanation about to whom and how these acts are addressed politely. Then, the learners are expected to discuss the form of requests and practice them directly. As a result, after the learners are directly guided to the target forms by instruction, they can use the language appropriately based on the contexts.

Focusing on the exposure to EFL, the explicit pragmatic instruction is claimed to be able to provide more opportunities for learners to develop their pragmatic competence. In contrast, lack of exposure to EFL can slow down learners’ pragmatic competence development since the learners have no interaction with native speakers of foreign language outside of the classroom. According to Kasper and Rose (2002), in order to provide opportunities for EFL learners to enhance their pragmatic performance, there are two main features that can be implemented in the classroom. They are the exposure to input and production of output by using the language, and planned instruction of pragmatic

relies on Acts of Indonesian Republic Number 24 Year 2009, Verse 25 (3) which states that English can be a device of classroom instruction of teaching the target language (English). This means that English teachers of secondary school levels are encouraged to use English in classroom communication practices on the grounds that it provides English exposure which could facilitate students to maximally gain the target language. This is supported by Ellis (2003) advocating that use of English in classroom communication provides second language learners (including secondary school students in Yogyakarta) with English exposures which become one of the determining factors to the success of acquiring the target language as maximal as possible. This leads to raising an assumption that having sufficient English exposures could facilitate students of secondary school levels to successfully gain the target language. For this reason, some English teachers of secondary schools in Yogyakarta tend to use English exclusively in classroom communication practices as performed in a series of English language teaching and learning starting from opening to closing.

The exclusive use of English by English teachers of secondary schools as a means of classroom communications as reflected through their speech acts potentially creates misunderstanding on the part of students when the students have insufficient knowledge of how English is used in context which is called knowledge of pragmatics. For example, the expression “Take one, pass them on” to some extent confuses some students of secondary schools who are not familiar with the form of illocutionary acts and illocutionary forces. In terms of the type of the illocutionary acts, the expression is categorized as a directive which means asking students to make an action. In terms of the illocutionary force, the expression means that the English teacher commands students to take one of the given copies and then give the other copies to the other students. The utterance “why didn’t you study last night” has two interpretations. The first interpretation is that the English teacher wants to know the reason why the student did not study the material. The second interpretation is that the English teacher suggests that students should study before they join the English class in order that they do not find difficulty to join the English lesson. Such pragmatic knowledge is of great importance for students of secondary school levels in order to minimize some possible mis-interpretations which lead to having communication barriers between English teachers and students in classroom communication practices. This directly or indirectly determines the failure of acquiring the target language.
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ABSTRACT
To maximally acquire the target language, second language learners are demanded to master the knowledge of pragmatics on the grounds that it facilitates them to capture a comprehensive understanding of the classroom communication patterns which deal with how language is used according to its context. Added to this, knowledge of pragmatics can be used to minimise miscommunication and misunderstanding of the speech acts used in classroom communication practices. More specifically, second language learners have to acquire the issues of pragmatics which include types of illocutionary acts, illocutionary force, and implicatures. Such aspects of pragmatics are commonly found in classroom communication practices which are done by English teachers of secondary school levels. In reference to these issues, this paper attempts to review the types of illocutionary acts, illocutionary forces and conversational implicatures applied by English teachers of secondary school levels. Such an understanding of those three aspects of pragmatics is believed to facilitate students of secondary schools as the second language learners to easily make sense of the utterances as performed by English teachers in a series of English language teaching and learning practices.
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INTRODUCTION
In Indonesia, English serves twofold functions, namely as a content subject which is officially taught from the secondary school level to tertiary one and as a means of classroom instructions in the process of English language teaching and learning (Margana, 2004). The use of English as a means of classroom instruction acquisition. This claim supports the classroom-based studies discussed by Belz (2007). She reviewed how computer mediation in instruction developed EFL learners' pragmatic competence in some related research studies. She revealed that computer mediation, which develops instructional materials, had potential contributions to provide opportunities for learners to raise their pragmatic awareness. In the same line, Jernigan (2012) examined the effectiveness of one of instructional options, which is output-focused video-based instruction for EFL learners' pragmatic development. More specifically, he compared the effect of output-focused video-based instruction and comprehension-focused instruction on learners' perception of pragmatic appropriateness and production in written language. He found that the instructional treatment significantly contributed to learners' perception. Unfortunately, it did not give a clear picture of pragmalinguistic forms used in written form. Thus, the teacher should be able to create a classroom environment that support the learners to put the foreign language into practice since they lack activities which accommodate their pragmatic competence development.

Explicit pragmatic instruction has also been asserted to have a significant role for adult EFL learners. In the area of Second Language Acquisition (SLA), this issue has been examined by some research which shows that adult learners prefer the explicit knowledge when they learn a new language by using certain strategies (Cohen, 2003). These EFL learning strategies normally attribute to particular techniques to meet the learning needs. For instance, when the adult learners learn how to give compliments in target language in certain situation, they analyse the situation given, try to put themselves, practice, and evaluate their progress in making the compliments.

Another research on the effect of explicit metapragmatic instruction on advanced EFL learners' speech act comprehension was conducted by Rasekh-Eslami, Rasekh-Eslami, and Fatahi (2004). The target forms were requests, apology, and complaining acts. They revealed that explicit metapragmatic instruction benefited the advanced EFL learners by giving them input enhancement of the targeted speech acts. In other words, the explicit instruction not only gained advanced EFL learners' awareness of input pragmatic features, but also enhanced their performance to produce the speech acts appropriately. Therefore, the role of explicit pragmatic instruction is relatively significant for adult learners.
Further claim is that the explicit pragmatic instruction can address certain EFL learners’ repeated mistakes in their speech act production due to negative pragmatic transfer. For example, when Indonesian EFL learners get a compliment from their friend about their appearance or performance in English, they tend to respond it by saying ‘Oh, that’s okay!’ It can lead to breakdowns and confusion in interaction with native speakers. Since negative pragmatic transfer results in confusion in EFL learners’ communication, the teacher should directly clarify the negative transfers from the first language (L1) to the target language (L2). Otherwise, this makes EFL learners keep repeating the same mistakes. However, it should be noted that the teacher should use a good strategy to give direct correction in order not to make the EFL learners stressful and shy when they want to speak up. Some research studies have investigated the effect of explicit and implicit teaching by involving corrective feedbacks into the instruction (Takahashi, 2001; Tateyama, 2001; Nipaspong, & Chinokul, 2010). By giving feedbacks in the explicit instruction, the EFL learners find it useful since the teacher explicitly correct the mistakes they make while they are using the language. Hence, the explicit instruction can facilitate the teacher to correct EFL learners’ mistakes in their language production.

**Implicit Pragmatic Instruction**

In contrast, some studies have also been conducted to show how the implicit instruction can be operationalised on pragmatic learning to focus on speech act forms (Fukuya, 1998; Fukuya and Clark, 2001; and Martinez-Flor, 2004). Fukuya (1998) investigated the use of recasts as implicit feedback on EFL learners’ request acts production. The author implemented a technique of interaction enhancement, such as demonstrating a smiley face to reflect a correct response and a sad face to show an error response to some pragmatic elements like pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic errors. Besides showing a sad face to show an error response, this technique also included repetition of learners’ inappropriate sentences with rising intonation. The results revealed that this technique was useful even though it was not significantly effective. In similar fashion, Fukuya and Clark (2001) applied a technique of input enhancement to get EFL learners’ attention to the target forms of speech act. While explicit group learners received the explicit instruction on sociopragmatic elements of request mitigators, the request mitigator enhancements was provided to implicit group learners. The findings did not
CONCLUSION

The importance of input and interaction has been perceived to be necessary in second language acquisition. Theoretically, the 'right size and form' of input and the appropriate frequency of interaction will be likely to result in more effective second language acquisition.

However, this paper does not discuss output which is also considered as important as input and interaction. In practice, the three elements input, interaction and output support one another and may occur at the same time of learning. When alone, the elements provide nothing for learners to acquire language but passive information that will remain static. As has been discussed, many research findings still show various influences of input and interaction and the extent to which they promote L2 acquisition. Difficulties in providing sufficient representative data, limitation on particular potential influences on input and interaction have become the major obstacles in similar research. However, those two elements are, indeed, existent and have been proved prominent in L2 acquisition.
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Having discussed aforementioned studies, it can be seen that the instruction is an essential aspect in raising EFL learners' pragmatic competence. On the other hand, Martinez-Flor (2004) combined two implicit techniques, which were input enhancements and recasts, to examine the effect of implicit and explicit teaching on the speech act of suggestions. Her study found that the implicit and explicit instruction did not illustrate any significance differences on EFL learners' performance of suggestion production. Briefly, these three studies have tried to show empirical evidence of the effect of implicit and explicit instructions that positively contributed to ELF learners' pragmatic ability. More specifically, implicit pragmatic instruction affects EFL learners' pragmatic competence development despite the insignificant result compared to the explicit instruction.

Regarding whether the explicit instruction more effectively contributes to adult EFL learners than the implicit instruction does, Lichtman (2012), however, found that there was no significant different between child and adult EFL learners when they received implicit and explicit instruction. As he conducted his two comprised empirical studies, he compared the performance of child and adult EFL learners in two different treatments. The first treatment was on a story-listening-and-rewriting task, which adopted implicit knowledge, and a verb conjugation task which adopted explicit knowledge. In the second one, he manipulated the instruction in which the artificial mini-language was taught explicitly and explicitly for child and adult EFL learners. Based on the findings, he contended that the shift from implicit learning in the childhood to explicit learning in adulthood was not necessarily caused by age factor only. Rather, both implicit and explicit instructions are able to affect any age to some extent. Thus, either child or adult EFL learners can get benefits from implicit and explicit instruction on EFL learning contexts.
attention to main features of pragmatic such as, social context, functional language use, and interaction, when they want to design and develop pragmatic teaching materials (Taguchi, 2011). Some materials and activities, such as: receptive-skill tasks (e.g. listening to video or audio with pragmatic features) and productive-skills tasks (e.g. structured conversations and Oral Discourse Completion Task (ODCT) are practically useful for teaching pragmatics. These tasks are available in textbooks focusing on the pragmatic skill development.

Furthermore, technology tools recently have provided interesting materials for pragmatic teaching. This might be due to the main instructional features provided by technology tools (e.g. multimedia environment, interactive input and simulation) which support the process of pragmatic teaching and learning in the classroom. For instance, implementing the feature of Computer-assisted language learning (CALL), Ward et al. (2007) developed a computer application for Arabic learners to record their utterances, and this application then analysed the timing and the frequency of recorded utterances and gave corrective feedbacks. Similarly, Utashiro and Kawai (2009) designed a computer-based course called 'DiscourseWare' and explored its effect on Japanese reactive tokens learning or backchannel signals, such as sodesuka ('I see') and honto ('really'). The results of these two CALL studies showed significant effects on learners' receptive and productive skills. Moreover, web sites that provide interactive multimedia lessons are also useful because EFL learners can watch video clips of conversations containing oral speech acts explanations, some cultural tips, and exercises.

CONCLUSION

To sum up, even though implicit instruction is more practical to draw EFL learners' initial attention to pragmatic features, the explicit pragmatic instruction is significantly more effective in both raising EFL learners' pragmatic awareness and developing their pragmatic performance. Some accessible potential instructional resources and materials are also available for teaching pragmatics in the classroom. Therefore, developing materials and activities to improve the learners' pragmatic performance is not a problem as long as the teachers are concerned on some key elements of pragmatic competence.

perceived to help learners proceed with the association of meanings. These two theories seem to point out the urgency of interaction in order to accomplish second language acquisition.

On the other hand, a well known hypothesis that relates to interaction is Interaction Hypothesis, which is proposed by Long. This hypothesis can be seen as the follow up of Krashen's input hypothesis. The interaction hypothesis concerns with the talk between native speakers-native speakers and native speakers-non native speakers. Accordingly, there could be many issues that emerge from the interaction. Native speakers-native speakers may be involved in a continuous talk without obstacles, while native speakers-non native speakers might create a problem of repetition, clarification, and confirmation (Mitchell and Myles, 2004). Thus, second language acquisition does require interaction as a means to proceed from the input the learners get in order to obtain maximum acquisition or commonly called as 'native-like'.

The intensive interaction between native speakers-non native speakers may result in better second language acquisition in that learners are sufficiently exposed to the target language. Moreover, the language learners who involve in conversational interaction could be said to build the building blocks of language development (Long in Gass and Selinker, 2001). Therefore, it may be indicated that learners can proceed to the interaction stage when they are certain that they have got the language meanings or associate meanings from the interlocutor. This is how an interaction may happen.

Intensive interaction, however, will seem to result in more automatic language learning that facilitates language acquisition. Learners who are exposed to particular language will build cognitive systems that can be activated any time when a stimulus is provided. This issue relates to the fundamental notion in second language acquisition: automaticity and restructuring (Gas and Selinker, 2001). While automaticity has something to do with the linguistic knowledge, the restructuring refers to the “internalized representations as a result of new learning”. The more intensive interaction that involves cognitive and social domains, the better the language performance and the closer to second language acquisition are.
input. The output, in this case, is the result of instant interaction which can be assumed as the 'activation of previous knowledge'. What is called by 'activation of previous knowledge' is that he/she might have known a little about the second language, and then it is activated. The previous input that he/she had might not be realized but it can emerge as a result of a sudden interaction.

In a more well-planned second language acquisition, just as that of the second language learning, the model of input can be presented and selected in order to meet the needs of the target learners. As the above example is an immediate input-interaction-output process, the well-prepared input-interaction-output may result in better second language acquisition. In comparison, the well-prepared process of giving input, facilitating interaction and thus producing output needs to be mapped and prior objective needs to be determined. This may be called the input follow up (my own term) that shows the possible further steps in second language acquisition. Whereas, the previous example can be called as the input pop up; this refers to the cyclical and immediate process of input, interaction and output.

Interaction or conversation seems to be an instrument to negotiate meaning. To negotiate means to respond properly to the questions which are given (Gass and Selinker, 2001, p. 272). A research finding shows that interaction that involves meaning appears to help learners in L2 acquisition (Loschky in Mitchell and Myles, 2004, p. 168). For example, nonnative speakers often produce inappropriate utterances. Native speakers, in this case, frequently modify the utterances in order to become understandable and it may make the interaction keeps on going. Such interaction is, indeed, helpful for L2 learners to get closer to the model language of the native speakers. Through interaction, L2 learners understand their competence in applying the knowledge they have learned.

INTERACTION HYPOTHESIS AND INTERACTIONIST

According to the interactionist theories, acquisition could be perceived as “a product of the complex interaction of the linguistic environment and the learner’s internal mechanisms, with neither viewed as primary” (Ellis, 2003, p. 243). While there are many interactionist theories, there are two views that are widely discussed: the cognitive interactionists and the social interactionist. The cognitive theory pays more attention to the cognitive processes in the learner’s internal mechanisms, whereas the latter sees the importance of “verbal interaction” that is
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One of the controversies that is against Krashen's input hypothesis is the behaviorist theory stating that the acquisition process can be controlled by providing learners with “input in the right-sized doses” and also providing the reinforcement of the practices (Ellis, 2003, p. 26). This contrasting view on the role of input in second language acquisition has been widely discussed, yet there has not been an agreement on how far input plays an important role in second language acquisition.

Basically, the behaviorist theory accounts for the existence of stimuli and responses without paying too much attention to the cognitive process in the learners’ mind. They also emphasize on the feedback availability as the measurement of input manipulation, which is considered appropriate (Ellis, 2003, p 243).

As the controversies go on, it can be assumed that behaviorism seems to emphasize on the reinforcement or providing stimulus to obtain response. This view sees the consistency of giving what is assumed to be sufficient or at the right dose input then providing the follow up in terms of interaction. Therefore, discussing on input only seems to be insufficient. To get better description and correlation, the discussion on interaction may also be posed as another important aspect in second language acquisition.

INTERACTION: THE INPUT FOLLOW-UP OR THE INPUT POP UP

Interaction can not be separated from input and output in that interaction acts as the mediator or tools between the two terms. Given that interaction may occur at the same time of input, the interaction process appears to be the practical tools for learners to contextualize the input they get. Furthermore, the terms of input, interaction and output may occur at a few distance of time that the process could be cyclical. A learner, for example, may get input because he/she interacts with either native speakers or non native speakers who speak a second language. Then, at no time at all he/she has to response the stimuli by using the immediate knowledge or way how to know the position of the learners’ level in order to know the right time to give them one step higher level of input (Mitchell and Myles, 2004, p. 48). Therefore, many theories that are proposed later seem to improve and give more alternatives on how second language can be acquired. Besides, controversies among the input processing and the output are still debatable.

Basically, the behaviorist theory accounts for the existence of stimuli and responses without paying too much attention to the cognitive process in the learners’ mind. They also emphasize on the feedback availability as the measurement of input manipulation, which is considered appropriate (Ellis, 2003, p 243).

As the controversies go on, it can be assumed that behaviorism seems to emphasize on the reinforcement or providing stimulus to obtain response. This view sees the consistency of giving what is assumed to be sufficient or at the right dose input then providing the follow up in terms of interaction. Therefore, discussing on input only seems to be insufficient. To get better description and correlation, the discussion on interaction may also be posed as another important aspect in second language acquisition.