Promoting EFL Learners' Pragmatic Awareness Through Test-Teach-Test (TTT) Method via *Telegram* and *Edmodo*[1]

Mansoureh Rahman Niaghi[2], *Islamic Azad University, Qazvin Branch, Qazvin, Iran*

Abstract

This study was designed to see if using Test-Teach-Test (TTT) method via *Telegram* and *Edmodo* can promote EFL Learners' pragmatic awareness. To fulfill this aim, the researcher selected 93 learners from an initial pool of 130 female, pre-intermediate learners based on their performance on the Preliminary English Test (PET). The selected 93 learners were placed into three groups including: experimental group one (N=31), which received TTT via *Edmodo*; experimental group two (N=33), which was exposed to TTT through *Telegram*; and the comparison group (N=29), which received face-to-face (F-to-F) instruction using the TTT method. Prior to the treatment, the three groups took the pragmatic awareness test as the pretest. After the treatment, the researcher gave the three groups the pragmatic awareness test as the posttest. The results of One-way ANOVA revealed that TTT via both *Telegram* and *Edmodo* significantly improved Iranian EFL learners' pragmatic awareness. Moreover, the results demonstrated that TTT employed via *Edmodo* was more effective in enhancing English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners' pragmatic awareness compared to TTT used through *Telegram*. Based on the findings, EFL teachers are recommended to use social networking tools in general and *Edmodo* in particular to promote EFL learners' pragmatic awareness.

Resumen

Este estudio tiene como objetivo ver si el uso del método Test-Teach-Test (TTT) a través de *Telegram* y *Edmodo* puede promover la conciencia pragmática de los estudiantes de ILE. Para cumplir con este objetivo, el investigador seleccionó a 93 estudiantes de un grupo inicial de 130 estudiantes de nivel pre-intermedio en función de su desempeño en la Prueba Preliminar de Inglés (PET). Los 93 alumnos seleccionados se ubicaron en tres grupos, incluidos: el grupo experimental uno (N = 31), que recibió TTT a través de *Edmodo*; grupo experimental dos (N=33), que fue expuesto a TTT a través de *Telegram*; y el grupo de comparación (N=29), que recibió instrucción presencial (F-to-F) utilizando el método TTT. Antes del tratamiento, los tres grupos tomaron la prueba de conciencia pragmática como prueba previa. Después del tratamiento, el investigador entregó a los tres grupos la prueba de conciencia pragmática como prueba posterior. Los resultados de ANOVA unidireccional revelaron que TTT a través de *Telegram* y de *Edmodo* mejoraron significativamente la conciencia pragmática de los estudiantes iraníes de EFL. Además, los resultados demostraron que TTT empleado a través de *Edmodo* fue más eficaz para mejorar la conciencia pragmática de los estudiantes de EFL en comparación con TTT utilizado a través de *Telegram*. Según los hallazgos, se recomienda a los profesores de EFL que utilicen herramientas de redes sociales en general y *Edmodo* en particular para promover la conciencia pragmática de los estudiantes de EFL.

Introduction

With the advent of communicative language teaching (CLT), the ultimate goal in language learning both in English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as Foreign Language (EFL) settings has become effective communication (Rahman & Pandian, 2018). Thus, learning to communicate has become the focal point of language learning and teaching in contrast to the previous focus on grammar (Jenkins, 2003). The introduction of communicative competence into English Language Teaching (ELT) also highly emphasizes the learners' ability to communicate as the main goal of language teaching and learning (Savignon, 2007). According to Savignon (2017), the term communicative competence is concerned with an individual's linguistic knowledge (both tacit lexical and structural) and the ability to put such knowledge into effective use.

The apt use of language requires both the correct and appropriate use of structural and lexical knowledge and the optimal utilization of pragmatic knowledge (Alcon-Soler, 2015). As pointed out by Alcon-Soler (2015), as a component of communicative competence, pragmatic competence has to do with knowing the communicative action and, more importantly, how such knowledge must be used appropriately in a given context. In the view of Murray (2010), pragmatic competence can be described as the grasp of the relationship between form and context, making it possible for individuals to accurately and appropriately express and interpret intended meanings. Therefore, a thorough grasp of pragmatic competence requires the ability to use different linguistic formulae appropriately during interactions in a particular social and cultural context (Usó-Juan & Martínez-Floor, 2008). However, it is a challenge for second language (L2) learners to gain this level of competence, especially in EFL settings where there is limited exposure to the

target language. As indicated by many studies (e.g., Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; Boxer & Pickering, 1995; Kasper, 1997), there is no guarantee that even learners who enjoy a sophisticated level of grammatical proficiency have a pragmatic competence comparable to that of native speakers. In the same vein, Bardovi-Harlig (2001) asserts that even learners with highly developed English and grammatical competency are likely to use language improperly, diverting from target-language pragmatic conventions.

As a matter of fact, L2 teaching must involve both linguistic and pragmatic aspects of language. Research evidence shows that poor pragmatic competence is the main EFL learners' Achilles heel since foreign language learners do not have access to ample authentic input due to the lack of the social context where they can learn the sociolinguistic rules and pragmatic aspects of language (Usó-Juan & Martínez-Floor, 2008). Thus, it is critical to assist learners in improving their pragmatic competence in an attempt to help them communicate more effectively and appropriately in the target language. With the advent of technology, more modern options in the field of Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) which possess the potential to contribute to improving learners' pragmatic competence have become available to teachers.

Today, learners live in a world full of modern communicative technologies (Bouhnik & Deshen, 2014). Given the pervasive application of computers and mobile phones, the use of such devices has been steadily increasing for educational purposes in general and L2 learning purposes in particular. Despite the evolving nature of CALL, most of the research has zeroed in on linguistic benefits associated with vocabulary, grammar, and negotiation of meaning through the application of glosses, CMC, game programs, and mobile technologies (Plonsky & Ziegler, 2016). A review of the literature shows that the pragmatic studies in the field of CALL are insufficient (González-Lloret, 2019). According to González-Lloret (2019), such paucity of second language (L2) pragmatic studies in CALL is unexpected given that pragmatic competence is considered one of the crucial components of communicative competence. This is even more surprising given that most of the technologies today are in service of communication. One of the CALL options available for working on pragmatic awareness is the use of social network tools, such as *Telegram* and *Edmodo*.

Launched in 2013, *Telegram* is a web-based applications that is used globally (Ghobadi & Taki, 2018). Various devices (e.g., tablet, PC, and mobile) can support a *Telegram* account, so that sent files and messages can be displayed on all devices synchronously (Ebrahimi et al., 2016). Iranians use this application more often than other social networks due to its accessibility and user-friendliness (Mashhadi Heidar & Kaviani, 2016). Vivienne (2016) maintains that *Telegram* makes it possible for the users to create groups of up to 5000 members, paving the way for much interaction, which facilitates learning. Furthermore, each member can give their ideas and comments on the content posted by any other members via the reply option available on the app. These make this app an appropriate platform for learning (Vivienne, 2016). In Iran, a large online community use *Telegram* for both social networking (Ghobadi & Taki, 2018) and educational purposes (e.g., Abbasi & Behjat, 2018; Khodabandeh, 2020; Vahdat et al., 2020). Thus, due to its potential contributions, *Telegram* has been under numerous investigations in language learning contexts since its inception (e.g., Abu-Ayfah, 2020; Ghaemi & Seyed Golshan, 2017; Ghobadi & Taki, 2018; Heidari Tabrizi & Onvani, 2018; Khodabandeh, 2020; Vahdat, et al., 2020). More specifically, results of previous investigations have revealed the usefulness of *Telegram* in contributing to vocabulary learning (e.g., Ghaemi & Seyed Golshan, 2017; Ghobadi & Taki, 2018; Heidari Tabrizi & Onvani, 2018), knowledge of collocations (Vahdat et al., 2020), and speaking complexity (Abbasi & Behjat, 2018). Another strand of studies (e.g., Abu-Ayfah, 2020; Khodabandeh, 2020) has shown that EFL learners hold positive attitudes towards the use of *Telegram* in EFL learning.

Another social network tool that is used widely for educational purposes is *Edmodo*. As a useful and secure social platform, *Edmodo* can be downloaded freely at www.*Edmodo*.com (Duncan & Chandler, 2011). This platform can play an important role in enhancing English language skills (Al-Kathiri, 2014; Mokhta & Dzakiria, 2015). It is generally accepted that *Edmodo* can contribute to the facilitation of the learning process given the limited time available at each class. Therefore, this platform allows the L2 learners to focus their attention on L2 learning, to pose many questions, to provide feedback and responses, to correct peer errors, to contribute their ideas, and even to share knowledge anywhere and anytime online (Chandler & Redman, 2013; Lara, 2013). The effects of *Edmodo* on writing instruction have been studied in recent years (e.g., Abadi et al., 2015; Adas & Bakir, 2013; Karyawati, 2014), with most studies dealing with the application of *Edmodo* aimed at enhancing secondary or high school students' writing skill (e.g., Al-Kathiri, 2015; Janpho et al., 2015; Noviana et al., 2015; Tsiakyroudi, 2018). In summary, the results of previous studies showed an improvement in writing performance due to the application of *Edmodo*.

The convenience provided by *Edmodo* for both learners and teachers with respect to providing feedback is one of the main features, and this can pave the way for raising pragmatic awareness. Such convenience is due to the ease with which internet links are provided in groups and sub-groups. This makes it possible for learners to easily check the history of online resources related to a particular topic. Learners are also able to edit their responses and repost them conveniently. Similarly, teachers can also easily post pertinent materials to the groups and sub-groups, providing feedback on students' responses. Therefore, teachers can provide direct and indirect feedback on L2 content, as well as supportive materials. The latter are likely to focus students' attention on the parts which need further explanation. Consequently, learners' pragmatic awareness is improved. The feedback provided on *Edmodo* and that provided by conventional feedback is different in that the only former provides supportive materials which can contribute to learners' L2 performance.

One of the ways through which teachers can provide learners with feedback is the Test-Teach-Test (TTT) approach which helps learners to initially complete a task without any help from the teacher, followed by the planning and presentation of the target language by the teacher based on the problems seen. Then, learners take part in another task to practice the new language (Scrivener, 2011). Scrivener notes further that based on TTT, teachers should give students a task, which requires them to use language and then, based on the learners' performance on the task, offer them correction, explanation, input, among others. According to Boundjema (2014), TTT allows teachers to elicit the specific linguistic needs of learners and address these needs effectively. The results of previous investigations have substantiated the effectiveness of TTT in improving EFL learners' writing performance (Shweiki, 2018), vocabulary, grammar, and reading comprehension (Paudel, 2018).

As the above review indicates, both *Telegram* and *Edmodo* have proved effective in improving EFL learners' language skills and components. Moreover, the findings of previous studies have also revealed that EFL learners hold positive attitudes towards the use of these two social networking tools in language classes. Likewise, previous studies on TTT have demonstrated that TTT is an effective approach in improving different language skills and components. However, there is a gap in the empirical literature probing the effect of TTT on promoting pragmatic awareness via *Edmodo* and *Telegram*, which will be the focus of the present investigation.

Objectives of the Study

This study explores if using Test-Teach-Test (TTT) method via *Telegram* and Edmodo can promote EFL Learners' pragmatic awareness. For this purpose, the following research questions are formulated:

> RQ1: Does the use of TTT method via *Edmodo* significantly improve Iranian EFL learners' pragmatic awareness?

> RQ2: Does the use of TTT method via *Telegram* significantly improve Iranian EFL learners' pragmatic awareness?

> RQ3: Is there any significant difference between the use of TTT method via *Edmodo* and *Telegram* on improving Iranian EFL learners' pragmatic awareness?

Method

Participants

The initial participants of the current study included 130 adult EFL pre-intermediate learners. The participants were all female as only female learners were available to the researcher. The age range of the participants was from 18 to 36, and they were all Persian speakers learning English as a foreign language in a language school in Tehran, Iran. The participants were selected based on convenience; non-random sampling as pure random sampling was not feasible for the researcher. The researcher administered Preliminary English Test (PET) to the original 130 students and selected only 93 learners whose scores fall within the range of +/- one standard deviation from the mean. Prior to administering the PET, the researcher provided the participants with a brief explanation concerning the aims of the study. Following that, a consent form was distributed to the participants and they were requested to sign and return it to the researcher. In the consent form, it was clearly stated that participation in the present study was voluntary and participants had the choice to withdraw from the study at any stage they wished. Moreover, they were informed that the data collected would be used for research purposes only.

Instruments

Preliminary English Test (PET)

PET is made up of the following three papers:

>	Reading and Writing (Paper 1)
>
>	Listening (Paper 2)
>
>	Speaking (Paper 3)

The first paper (Reading and Writing) lasted for one hour and 30 minutes. The reading part was comprised of five parts (35 questions), which were designed to assess different reading skills. To this end, it made use of various texts (e.g., very short notices to extended texts). The writing, as a sub-section of paper one, was made up of three parts, assessing a variety of writing skills. This section consisted of eight questions. Paper 2 (listening) took 30 minutes to complete and was made up of four parts. These parts range from short exchanges to longer dialogues and monologues and had 25 questions. The final paper, namely, speaking, took 10-12 minutes per pair of candidates and consisted of four parts. The candidates engaged in interaction with an examiner on parts one and two. As for parts three and four, the candidates interacted with another candidate. In part three, the candidates took part in a longer oral participation. Based on the *PET Handbook for Teachers* by Cambridge, ESOL examinations target four crucial qualities: validity, reliability, impact, and practicality.

Pragmatic Awareness Test

This study used a test developed by Roever (2006) to assess pragmatic awareness. The instrument had three subtests with the following sections: implicature section, a routines section, and a speech act section. The first section was comprised of twelve items aimed at testing the students' comprehension of idiosyncratic and formulaic implicature (Roever, 2006). Thus, the first section assessed the extent to which the test taker knew about language use in specific situations. The test taker needed to answer within twelve minutes. In each item, following the description of a situation, the participants were asked what the individual in question would probably say in the situation. One item for this section was:

Jay is waiting for the light to change so he can cross the street when a woman approaches him and says: "Excuse me, do you know where the train station is?"

What does the woman probably mean?

1. She is asking for directions.

2. She is testing Jay's knowledge of the town.

3. She is looking for a taxi.

4. She isn't sure if the light is green.

The routines section was made up of strongly situationally bound expressions (meal, telephone), along with more functional routines (greetings, introductions, second pair parts) (Roever, 2006). As Rover contends, the second pair parts refer to the second interactant's responses in an interpersonal interaction. One sample item tapping into the second pair parts as a subsection of the main routines section was:

Tim runs into his old friend Pam at a party. Pam says, "How are you?"

What would Tim probably say?

1. "I have a headache."

2. "Thank you."

3. "I'm Tim."

4. "Good, how are you?"

The second section measured the extent to which the test taker grasped what people mean when they are speaking indirectly. This section consisted of twelve items and took the test taker at the most twelve minutes to finish. In each item, following the description of a situation, one of the individuals in the situation said something. This was followed by asking each test taker what the person probably meant.

The speech act section was made up of twelve short-answer items, given in the form of discourse completion tasks. Each of four items tested each of these three speech acts of request, apology, and refusal (Roever, 2006). This section aimed to discover if the test taker knew how people express themselves in everyday conversations. This section consisted of twelve items and took the test taker eighteen minutes to complete. A short conversation between two individuals in each item appeared, but the test taker only saw what one of the two people was saying. They needed to read the whole conversation first, and then they had to fill in what the other individual probably said. An example item for this section was:

> *Sam was late for an important business meeting because the traffic was very bad. He and his colleague Mary lost an important deal because of that. After the meeting, Mary talks to Sam. Mary: Sam, what's going on? We lost the deal because you were late!"*

> What would Sam probably say? Make sure your choice fits the situation and Mary's answer.

> Sam:

> 1. "I'm sorry about that. "

> 2. "I'm really sorry, I got stuck in traffic."

> 3. "There was a lot of traffic."

> 4. "I didn't have my phone with me."

As pointed out by Roever (2006), the overall Cronbach's Alpha, standard error, and inter-rater reliability indices were .91, 7.31, and .96, respectively.

Procedure

Initially, 130 adult EFL pre-intermediate learners were selected non-randomly from among different online classes available to the researcher and given a PET. The scores on PET were drawn to select a homogenized group of learners in terms of overall language proficiency. The selected 93 learners were put into three groups, including: experimental group one (N=31), which received TTT via *Edmodo*; experimental group two (N=33), which was exposed to TTT via *Telegram*; and the comparison group (N=29), which received TTT via face-to-face (F-to-F) instruction. Prior to the treatment, the three groups took the pragmatic awareness test as the pretest to make sure that the three groups were not statistically different in terms of pragmatic knowledge. Next, the treatment unfolded in the three groups as follows:

As for the *Edmodo* group, for one session, the teacher provided instructions to learners on how to gain access to *Edmodo*. Next, learners were instructed about the various features of *Edmodo*. For instance, learners were given information about how to send and receive messages on the platform, and how to write sentences and paragraphs, and how to post them on *Edmodo*. Moreover, during the introduction sessions, the teacher helped the learners create their *Edmodo* accounts. After creating their accounts, learners received a code, which they were required to use to log in. Following that, for ten sessions, the learners received TTT for the three speech acts of request, apology, and refusal. TTT was implemented in line with Scrivener (2011). As he holds, based on TTT. teachers should give students a task to do in which they should use language and then, based on their performance on the task offer them correction, explanation, and input. Based on this definition, the learners were provided with tasks that entailed the correct use of request, apology, and refusal speech acts via *Edmodo*. Then, the learners needed to work collaboratively via the platform to do the set tasks. The learners also had the opportunity to use the links containing information relevant to the set tasks (e.g., relevant vocabulary, grammar, and speech act information) to do the assigned tasks. The student-derived links were provided either by the teacher or the learners. The links sent by the learners were initially sent to the teacher and only after the teacher approved of the relevant content, learners were allowed to post them on the platform. On completing the tasks, the teacher either offered input, correction, explanation, or further tasks to consolidate learning.

The second experimental group received TTT via *Telegram*. To do so, the researcher initially created a group on *Telegram* and added all class members to this group. Following that, the learners were provided with TTT for the three speech acts of request, apology, and refusal. To do so, learners were sent the speech act tasks via *Telegram* and were instructed to do the tasks in groups specified by the teacher on the same group page. Following that, based on learners' performance, they were provided with either input, correction, explanation, or further tasks to consolidate learning in order to implement TTT.

As for the comparison group, the TTT via the conventional method of teaching was used. In doing so, the learners were provided with TTT for the three speech acts of request, apology, and refusal in the classroom, and neither *Telegram* nor *Edmodo* were used for any instructional purposes concerning the speech acts. Thus, the teacher presented the speech act tasks in the classroom via F-to-F instruction, and learners were instructed to do the tasks in groups specified by the teacher in the class. Following that, based on learners' performance, they were provided with either input, correction, explanation, or further tasks to assist them to learn the speech acts in line with the TTT method.

It is noteworthy that since the instruction for the comparison group was carried out in an F-to-F fashion, the most spacious classroom of language school was chosen as the present study was carried out during the Covid-19 period. One week before the beginning of treatment, the classroom was prepared to be appropriate for teaching purposes. During Covid-19 time, based on the policies of the language school in which the study was carried out, blended learning was the norm. Thus, the researcher invited those learners who were willing to participate in the study during their F-to-F instructional period. To protect the health of students, teachers, school staff, and their families, in consultation with local officials, all prevention practices (e.g., appropriate and steady mask-wearing and staying home when sick) and environmental measures (e.g., personal distancing rules) were followed, carried out and regularly monitored. After treatment, which lasted ten sessions, the researcher gave the three groups the pragmatic awareness test as the posttest.

Results

Pretest Results

To ensure that the three groups of the study were not significantly different in terms of pragmatic awareness, a one-way ANOVA was run on the pretest scores for the comparison, *Telegram*, and *Edmodo* groups. Table 1 demonstrates the results of descriptive statistics for the pretest scores of the three groups.

	Descriptive Statistics									
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean		Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Pretest Comparison	29	6.00	16.00	10.206	.542	2.92012	.409	.434	.556	.545
Pretest *Telegram*	33	6.00	17.00	10.030	.442	2.54319	.428	.409	.765	.798
Pretest *Edmodo*	31	4.00	18.00	10.193	.574	3.19812	.468	.421	.681	.621
Valid (listwise)	29									

Table 1: Results of descriptive statistics for the Pragmatic Awareness Pretest scores of the comparison, *Telegram*, and *Edmodo* Groups

As shown in Table 1, the means for the comparison, *Telegram*, and *Edmodo* groups were 10.20, 10.03, and 10.19, respectively. To see whether the differences among the means of the groups were statistically significant, one-way ANOVA was run. To run the test, the three assumptions of interval data, normal distribution, and equal variances were checked. The quantitative data used in this study were the pragmatic awareness test scores, which are regarded as interval data. Thus, the assumption of interval data was checked. For normality assumption, as evident in Table 1, all the Skewness and Kurtosis Ratio values for the data sets were within the range +/- 1.96, which indicates that the normality assumption is guaranteed (Pallant, 2013). With respect to the third assumption, Homogeneity of Variances, the results are presented in Table 2.

	Test of Homogeneity of Variances			
		Levene Statistic	DF1	DF2	Sig.
Pretest Pragmatic Awareness	Based on Mean	.911	2	90	.406
	Based on Median	.622	2	90	.539
	Based on Median and with adjusted DF	.622	2	80.841	.539
	Based on trimmed mean	.852	2	90	.430

Table 2: Results of Test of Homogeneity of Variances on the pretest scores of the comparison, *Telegram*, and *Edmodo* Groups

As indicated in Table 2, all the sig values were above .05. Thus, it can be inferred that the assumption for Homogeneity of Variances is met for one-way ANOVA. Table 3 depicts the results of one-way ANOVA on the pretest scores for the three groups.

	ANOVA				
	Pretest Pragmatic Awareness				
	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.616	2	.308	.037	.964
Within Groups	752.567	90	8.362		
Total	753.183	92			

Table 3: Results of ANOVA on the pretest scores for the comparison, *Telegram*, and *Edmodo* Groups

As Table 3 shows, the sig equals .336, which is higher than the confidence level of 0.05. Therefore, there were not any significant differences among the three groups in terms of pragmatic awareness prior to treatment. Thus, any differences among the posttest scores of the three groups can be attributed to treatment types.

Posttest Results

To explore any significant differences among the posttest scores of the comparison, *Telegram*, and *Edmodo* groups, a one-way ANOVA was run on the posttest pragmatic accuracy scores of the three groups. Table 4 presents the results of descriptive statistics for the posttest scores of the comparison, *Telegram*, and *Edmodo* groups.

	Descriptive Statistics									
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean		Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Posttest Comparison	29	5.00	17.00	10.379	.519	2.79558	.422	.434	.858	.845
Posttest *Telegram*	33	10.00	19.00	13.6364	.426	2.44717	.428	.409	.753	.798
Posttest *Edmodo*	31	15.00	25.00	19.451	.483	2.69368	.401	.421	.777	.821
Valid N (listwise)	29									

Table 4: Results of descriptive statistics for the Pragmatic Awareness Posttest scores of the comparison, *Telegram*, and *Edmodo* Groups

As presented in Table 4, the means for the comparison, *Telegram*, and *Edmodo* groups on posttest were 10.37, 13.63, and 19.45, respectively. To see whether the differences among the means of the groups on the posttest were statistically significant, a one-way ANOVA was run. To run the test, the three assumptions of interval data, normal distribution, and equal variances were checked. The quantitative data used in this study were the pragmatic awareness test scores, which are regarded as interval data. Thus, the assumption of interval data was checked. For normality assumption, as seen in Table 4, all the Skewness and Kurtosis Ratio values for the data sets were within the range +/- 1.96, indicating that the normality assumption is guaranteed (Pallant, 2013). With respect to the third assumption, Homogeneity of Variances, the results are shown in Table 5.

	Test of Homogeneity of Variances			
		Levene Statistic	DF1	DF2	Sig.
Posttest Pragmatic Awareness	Based on Mean	.015	2	90	.985
	Based on Median	.006	2	90	.994
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.006	2	84.071	.994
	Based on trimmed mean	.010	2	90	.990

Table 5: Results of Test of Homogeneity of Variances on the Posttest Scores of the Comparison, *Telegram*, and E*dmodo* Groups

As presented in Table 5, all the sig values are above .05. Thus, it can be inferred that the assumption for Homogeneity of Variances is met for one-way ANOVA. Table 6 presents the results of one-way ANOVA on the posttest scores for the three groups.

	ANOVA				
	Posttest Pragmatic Awareness				
	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1276.783	2	638.392	91.469	.000
Within Groups	628.141	90	6.979		
Total	1904.925	92			

Table 6: Results of ANOVA on the posttest scores for the comparison, *Telegram*, and E*dmodo* Groups

As Table 6 indicates, there was a statistically significant difference at the $p < .05$ level among the mean scores of the three groups (F (2, 90) = 91.46, p = .00). Hence, the post-hoc Scheffe test was run to spot the differences among the three groups. Table 7 shows the results of the post-hoc Scheffe test for the posttest scores among the three groups.

		Multiple Comparisons				
		Dependent Variable: Posttest Pragmatic Awareness				
		Scheffe				
(I) Groups	(J) Groups	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Comparison	*Telegram*	-3.25705*	.67243	.000	-4.9308	-1.5833
	Edmodo	-9.07230*	.68250	.000	-10.7711	-7.3735
Telegram	Comparison	3.25705*	.67243	.000	1.5833	4.9308
	Edmodo	-5.81525*	.66078	.000	-7.4600	-4.1705
Edmodo	Comparison	9.07230*	.68250	.000	7.3735	10.7711
	Telegram	5.81525*	.66078	.000	4.1705	7.4600

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 7: Results of the Post-Hoc Scheffe Test for the posttest scores among the three groups

As seen in Table 7, the post-hoc comparisons using the Scheffe Test indicated that there was a significant difference ($p=0.00<0.05$) between the posttest score means of *Edmodo* group (M = 19.45, SD = 2.69) and the comparison group (M = 10.37, SD = 2.79) with the *Edmodo* group outperforming the comparison group. Thus, it can be inferred that TTT via *Edmodo* significantly improved Iranian EFL learners' pragmatic awareness. Moreover, as presented in Table 7, there was a significant difference ($p=0.00<0.05$) between the posttest score means of *Telegram* group (M = 13.63, SD = 2.44) and the comparison group (M = 10.37, SD = 2.79) with the *Telegram* group outperforming the comparison group. Thus, it can be inferred that TTT via *Telegram* significantly improved Iranian EFL learners' pragmatic awareness. Furthermore, as depicted in Table 7, there was a significant difference ($p=0.00<0.05$) between the posttest score means of the *Telegram* group (M = 13.63, SD = 2.44) and the *Edmodo* group (M = 19.45, SD = 2.69) with the *Edmodo* group outperforming the *Telegram* group. Therefore, it can be inferred that there was a significant difference between TTT via *Edmodo* and *Telegram* on improving Iranian EFL learners' pragmatic awareness with the *Edmodo* being more effective compared to *Telegram*.

Discussion

The present study probed whether Test-Teach-Test (TTT) via *Edmodo* significantly enhances Iranian EFL learners' pragmatic awareness. Furthermore, the study aimed at probing whether TTT method via *Telegram* significantly improves Iranian EFL learners' pragmatic awareness. Moreover, the study sought to discover any significant difference between the use of TTT method via *Edmodo* and *Telegram* on enhancing Iranian EFL learners' pragmatic awareness. The results of statistical analyses revealed that both *Telegram* and *Edmodo* had statistically significant effects on Iranian EFL learners' pragmatic awareness. Moreover, the results indicated that *Edmodo* was more effective in improving EFL learners' pragmatic awareness compared to *Telegram*.

The findings of the current study concerning the positive effect of *Edmodo* on pragmatic awareness substantiate the results of previous investigations (e.g., Abadi et al., 2015; Adas & Bakir, 2013; Al- Kathiri,

2015; Janpho et al., 2015; Karyawati, 2014; Mokhta & Dzakiria, 2015; Noviana et al., 2015; Tsiakyroudi, 2018), indicating the usefulness of *Edmodo* in contributing to developing various language skills and components. Likewise, the results of the present study concerning the positive impact of *Telegram* on pragmatic awareness confirm the results of previous studies (e.g., Abu-Ayfah, 2020; Khodabandeh, 2020; Vahdat et al., 2020), which showed the effectiveness of *Telegram* in improving different language skills and components.

The results of the current study show that both *Telegram* and *Edmodo* have positive effects on pragmatic awareness can be attributed to the special features of such technologies, which make language learning more interesting and effective compared to conventional methods of teaching (Khodabandeh, 2020). Furthermore, the accessibility and user-friendliness of such apps are also facilitating factors in raising pragmatic awareness. The motivational aspect related to the application technology for L2 learning is another factor that can account for the results of the current study. As mentioned by Stockwell (2013), the application of new technologies in L2 learning environments can reinforce learner motivation. Furthermore, Zhang et al. (2011) claim that these apps can improve learners' efficiency and autonomy. According to Steel (2012), the positive features of mobile applications, including ubiquity, portability, convenience, and flexibility make teaching and learning easier for both teachers and learners. Furthermore, Zou and Li (2015) note that such applications enable teachers to customize student learning, which provides a big advantage over conventional teaching. As Skehan (2003) maintains, apps can provide the learners with chances to take part in collaborative, interactive, meaningful, and challenging tasks, influencing L2 learning positively. Such applications have the potential for focusing learners' attention on the process of L2 learning in general and pragmatic awareness in particular.

Moreover, the results of the present study can also be explained in terms of the attributes of TTT. According to Hadfield (2011), TTT provides the learners with good chances for communicative practice during L2 learning. Moreover, TTT method is a suitable presentation technique given that it provides useful learning opportunities. As pointed out by Woodward (2010), as far as learning opportunities are concerned, the first 'test' stage provides the learners with a chance to remember and use what they have remembered. The 'teach' stage may give them a chance to get exposed to L2. They are also provided with chances to notice L2 features, and the second 'test' could provide an opportunity for use and refine level. Another possible reason for the findings of the present study is that TTT method enables the learners to notice the gaps in their L2 knowledge, making them more willing to attend to the L2 input (Hadfield, 2011).

The results of the present study concerning the outperformance of the learners working with *Edmodo* compared to *Telegram* can be justified based on the tenets of collaborative learning. In effect, *Edmodo* provides a more collaborative learning environment compared to *Telegram*. Henry et al. (2012) maintain that collaborative work has the potential to improve L2 learners' motivation, enhancing their perceptions of studying and learning. As a result, learners are provided with an opportunity to increase their pragmatic awareness. Furthermore, the ample support through collaboration also contributes to the positive impact of collaboration on pragmatic awareness. According to Kohonen (1992), collaboration allows L2 learners to move beyond their current linguistic comfort zone by expanding their Zone of Proximal Development (ZDP). Vygotsky (1978) states that Zone of Proximal Development (ZDP) has to do with the distance between the current developmental level mirrored by independent problem solving and the level of potential development mirrored by the capability to solve problems through other's assistance.

Collaboration can bring about multiple psychological benefits and contribute to all aspects of learning. For instance, participation in collaborative tasks improves L2 learners' skills (e.g., their creativity, social skills, and critical thinking). These are realized by making the L2 learners more autonomous and helping them to improve both individual and group teaching (Bölükabas et al., 2011). In fact, collective problem solving and thinking have the potential to make L2 learners take on more positive attitudes towards academic affairs. As a result, L2 learners feel more comfortable in the class due to their participation in constructive collaboration and social interaction, as they can play a more positive role in the learning process. Given these positive features and collaboration, learning is enhanced. Moreover, risk-taking and creativity in the L2 learning process improve self-esteem (Kohonen, 1992).

Another reason why learners in the *Edmodo* group outperformed those in the *Telegram* group can be attributed to the dominant features of *Edmodo* which were not possessed by *Telegram*. For example, *Edmodo* provides feedback by both learners and the teacher, as it provides supportive links for the pragmatic awareness tasks under instruction. The options provided by *Edmodo*, including online feedback along with

supportive materials specifically tailored to the point under instruction can improve learners' motivation (e.g., Alshawil & Alhomoud, 2016; Tsiakyroudi, 2018). This, in turn, can result in more engagement with tasks (Yusuf et al., 2018) and enhanced pragmatic awareness.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the present investigation, EFL teachers are recommended to employ social networking tools in general and *Edmodo* in particular when it comes to the enhancement of EFL learners' pragmatic awareness. Teacher educators may also draw on the findings of the present study when they intend to provide EFL teachers with awareness concerning the contribution of the use of TTT along with social networking tools to pragmatic awareness. Although the present study confirmed the results of previous investigations concerning the effectiveness of social learning networks on language learning, more replications of the current study are suggested to provide a more comprehensive picture of the role of such networks in promoting various language skills and components. The present study focused on pragmatic awareness. Language competence is not limited to pragmatic awareness and future researchers may investigate the use of TTT via *Telegram* and *Edmodo* on developing writing, reading, collocations, and phrasal verbs. Moreover, future studies may address different proficiency levels and also male learners to shed more light on the contributions of TTT via *Telegram* and *Edmodo* on developing different language skills and components.

References

Abbasi, M. & Behjat, F. (2018). The effect of storytelling via Telegram on Iranian EFL learners' speaking complexity. *International Journal of Educational Investigations*, 5(2), 28-40. http://www.ijeionline.com/attachments/article/66/IJEI.Vol.5.No.2.03.pdf

Abu-Ayfah, Z. A. (2020). *Telegram* app in learning English: EFL students' perceptions. *English Language Teaching*, 13(1), 51-62. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n1p51

Adas, D., & Bakir, A. (2013). Writing difficulties and new solutions: Blended learning as an approach to improve writing abilities. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(9), 254-266. http://www.ijhssnet.com/view.php?u=https://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_3_No_9_May_2013/28.pdf

Alcon-Soler, E. (2015). Pragmatic learning and study abroad: Effects of instruction and length of stay. *System*, 48, 62-74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.09.005

Al-Kathiri, F. (2015). Beyond the classroom walls: *Edmodo* in Saudi secondary school EFL instruction, attitudes and challenges. *English Language Teaching*, 8(1), 189-204. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n1p189

Alshawil, S. T., & Alhomoud, F. A. (2016). The impact of using *Edmodo* on Saudi university EFL students' motivation and teacher-student communication. *International Journal of Education*, 8(4), 105-121. https://doi.org/10.5296/ije.v8i4.10501

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics? In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching*, (pp. 13-32).

Bölükabas, F., Keskin, F., & Polat, M. (2011). The effectiveness of cooperative learning on reading comprehension skills in Turkish as foreign language. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 10(4), 330-335. http://www.tojet.net/articles/v10i4/10433.pdf

Bouhnik, D., & Deshen, M. (2014). WhatsApp goes to school: Mobile instant messaging between teachers and students. *Journal of Information Technology Education*, 13, 217–231. https://doi.org/10.28945/2051

Boundjema, F. (2014). *TTT technique for ESL learning* [Power Point slides]. Retrieved January, 2017 from http://www.slideshare.net/innovative14/test-teachtest-technique-for-esl-classes

Boxer, D., & Pickering, L. (1995). Problems in the presentation of speech acts in ELT materials: The case of complaints. *ELT Journal*, 49(1), 44-58. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/49.1.44

Chandler, P. D., & Redman, C. (2013). Teaching teachers for the future: Modelling and exploring immersive personal learning networks. *Australian Educational Computing*, 27(3), 54–62.

Duncan, J. C., & Chandler, P. D. (2011). *A community of practice for early career biology teachers: Social networking and digital Technologies.* Proceedings from the Symposium on Contemporary Approaches to Research in Mathematics, Science, Health and Environmental Education, pp. 1-9. Deakin University.

Ghaemi, F., & Seyed Golshan, N. (2017). The impact of a social network on teaching English vocabulary among Iranian intermediate EFL learners. *International Journal of Information and Communication Sciences*, 2(5), 86-92. http://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijics.20170205.15

Ghobadi, S., & Taki, S. (2018). Effects of Telegram stickers on English vocabulary learning: Focus on Iranian EFL learners. *Research in English Language Pedagogy*, 6(1), 139-158. https://doi.org/10.30486/relp.2018.538824

González-Lloret, M. (2019). Technology and L2 Pragmatics Learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 39(2), 113–127. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190519000047

Hadfield, J. (2011). What is test-teach-test? Pearson English Language Teaching. Retrieved March, 2017 from http://pearsoncolombia.com/imagenes/e_news_2020/february_march_2020/what_is_test.pdf

Heidari Tabrizi, H., & Onvani, N. (2018). The impact of employing Telegram app on Iranian EFL beginners' vocabulary teaching and learning. *Applied Research on English Language*, 7(1), 1-18. http://doi.org/10.22108/are.2017.103310.1087

Henry, L. A., Castek, J., O'Byrne, W. I., & Zawilinski, L. (2012). Using peer collaboration to support online reading, writing, and communication: An empowerment model for struggling readers. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 28(3), 279-306. https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2012.676431

Janpho, J., Chaeturat, C., & Multa, D. (2015). Enhancing English writing skill by using online social network Edmodo. *Journal of Education, Mahasarakham University*, 3(4), 707–712.

Jenkins, J. (2003). *World Englishes: A resource book for students*. Routledge.

Karyawati, A. (2014). *A descriptive study on the use of Edmodo website for English teaching and learning process in Salatiga State Institute for Islamic studies* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Salatiga State Institute for Islamic Studies.

Kasper, G. (1997). Can pragmatic competence be taught? [HTML document]. University of Hawai'i Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center. http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW06

Kaviani, M., & Mashhadi Heidar, D. (2016). The social impact of *Telegram* as a social network on teaching English vocabulary among Iranian intermediate EFL learners (Payman Noor Center). *Journal of Sociological Studies of Youth*, 7(23), 65-76. https://ssyj.babol.iau.ir/article_529813_97b580dd49aac9569d12416b44b20e0c.pdf

Khodabandeh, F. (2020). The effect of social network use on EFL learners' second language achievement: an investigation into their attitudes. *International Journal of Social Sciences*. 10(1), 25-37. https://ijss.srbiau.ac.ir/article_15722_0d48adf6f13b95d1fc505f5ac2749e9f.pdf

Kohonen, V. (1992). Experiential Language Learning: Second language learning as cooperative learner education. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Collaborative Language Learning and Teaching.* (pp. 81-99). Cambridge University Press.

Mokhta, F. A., & Dzakiria, H. (2015). Illuminating the potential of *Edmodo* as an interactive virtual learning platform for English language learning and teaching. *Malaysian Journal of Distance Education*, 17(1), 83−98. http://mjde.usm.my/vol17_1_2015/MJDE_17_1-6.epub

Murray, N. (2010). Pragmatics, awareness raising, and the Cooperative Principle. *ELT Journal*, 64(3), 293-301. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccp056

Noviana, O., Rufinus, A., & Bunau, E. (2015). The effective use of *Edmodo* in writing a narrative text in senior high school. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran, 4* (11), 3-17.

Pallant, J. (2013). *SPSS survival manual.* McGraw-Hill Education.

Paudel, P. (2018). Use of test-teach-test method in English as a foreign language classes. *Journal of NELTA Surkhet*, 5, 15-27. https://doi.org/10.3126/jns.v5i0.19482

Plonsky, L., & Ziegler, N. (2016). The CALL-SLA interface: Insights from a second-order synthesis. *Language Learning & Technology*, 20(2), 17−37. http://dx.doi.org/10125/44459

Rahman, M. M., & Pandian, A. (2018). A critical investigation of English language teaching in Bangladesh: Unfulfilled expectations after two decades of communicative language teaching. *English Today*, 34(3), 43-49. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026607841700061X

Roever, C. (2006), Validation of a web-based test of ESL pragmalinguistics. *Language Testing, 23*(3), 229-256. https://doi.org/10.1191/0265532206lt329oa

Savignon, S. J. (2007). Beyond communicative language teaching: What's ahead? *Journal of pragmatics*, 39(1), 207-220. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.09.004

Savignon, S. J. (2017). Communicative Competence. In J. I. Liontas, TESOL International Association, & M. DelliCarpini (Eds.), *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching.* Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0047

Scrivener, J. (2011). *Learning teaching: The essential guide to English language teaching.* Macmillan.

Shams-Abadi, B. B., Ahmadi, S. D., & Mehrdad, A. G. (2015). The effect of *Edmodo* on EFL learners' writing performance. *International Journal of Educational Investigations*, 2, 88-97. http://www.ijeionline.com/attachments/article/36/IJEIonline_Vol.2_No.2_2015-2-08.pdf

Shweiki, S. N. A. A. (2018). *The effect of applying the test-teach-test approach in improving the students' English language writing skill in East Jerusalem schools.* [Doctoral dissertation, An-Najah National University]. DSpace. https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.11888/14146

Skehan, P. (2003). Focus on form, tasks, and technology. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 16(5), 391-411. https://doi.org/10.1076/call.16.5.391.29489

Steel, C. (2012). Fitting learning into life: language students' perspectives on benefits of using mobile apps. In M. Brown, & M. Hartnett, (Eds.), *Proceedings of ASCILITE 2012, 25-28 November* (pp. 875-880). Ascilite. https://www.ascilite.org/conferences/Wellington12/2012/images/custom/steel%2c_caroline_-_fitting_learning.pdf

Stockwell, G. (2013). Technology and motivation in English language teaching and learning. In E. Ushioda (Ed.), *International perspectives in motivation: Language learning and professional challenges* (pp. 156-175). Palgrave Macmillan.

Tsiakyroudi, M. (2018). Exploring the effectiveness of *Edmodo* on Greek EFL B1 learners' motivation to write. *Research Papers in Language Teaching and Learning, 9*(1), 96-112. http://rpltl.eap.gr

Usó-Juan, E., & Martínez-Flor, A. (2008). Teaching learners to appropriately mitigate requests. *ELT Journal, 62*(4), 394-357. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccm092

Vahdat, S., Gooniband Shooshtari, Z., & Mazareian, F. (2020). The impact of the *Telegram* on learning of collocational knowledge among Iranian EFL high school students, *Applied Linguistics Research Journal, 2*(3), 37−51. https://dx.doi.org/10.14744/alrj.2020.18189

Vivienne, W. (2016, February 23). With Telegram, A reclusive social media star rises again. *Fortune.* http://fortune.com/telegram-pavel-durov-mobile-world-congress

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Harvard University Press.

Woodward, T. (2010). *Planning lessons and courses: Designing sequences of work for the language classroom.* Cambridge University Press.

Yusuf, Q., Yusuf, Y. Q., Erdiana, N., & Pratama, A. R. (2018). Engaging with Edmodo to teach English writing of narrative texts to EFL students. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century, 76*(3), 333-349. https://doi.org/10.33225/pec/18.76.333

Zhang, H., Song, W., & Burston, J. (2011). Reexamining the effectiveness of vocabulary learning via mobile phones. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET, 10*(3), 203-214. http://www.tojet.net/articles/v10i3/10322.pdf

Zou, B., & Li, J. (2015). Exploring mobile apps for English language teaching and learning. In F. Helm, L. Bradley, M. Guarda, & S. Thouesny (Eds.), *Critical CALL - Proceedings of the 2015 EUROCALL Conference* (pp. 564-568). Padova. http://dx.doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2015.000394