



Available online at:
<http://www.ulead.org.tr/journal>
*International Association of Research
in Foreign Language Education and Applied Linguistics*
ELT Research Journal
2013, 2(4), 176-190
ISSN: 2146-9814

Pragmatic Awareness of EFL Teacher Trainees and Their Reflections on Pragmatic Practices

Mehzudil Tuğba Yıldız Ekin¹
Uludağ University, Turkey

Ebru Atak Damar²
Uludağ University, Turkey

Abstract

Knowledge of pragmatics has been a crucial element of language teacher training programmes. Future teachers should be aware of the pragmatic constraints of the target language to teach it to the foreign language learners. In general, language teachers intensively focus on grammar during lessons as they may lack pragmatic awareness in the target language, or they have difficulty to put into practice the pragmatic knowledge they already possess. Thus, the present study aimed to investigate the pragmatic awareness of EFL teacher trainees and their use of and difficulties in practical pragmatic applications. A Discourse Completion Task (DCT) was given to 30 EFL teacher trainees to investigate their awareness of pragmatic knowledge. Also, teacher trainees wrote reflection papers about their strengths and weaknesses about pragmatics in their actual teaching process and planned and practised a specific pragmatics-focused lesson. 10 teacher trainees were interviewed to get in-depth information about the problems they faced in teaching pragmatics. DCT results indicated teacher trainees have pragmatic awareness; however, the reflection papers and interviews revealed that their awareness was mostly on theoretical pragmatic knowledge. Lesson plans and reflective comments written following the lessons indicated EFL teacher trainees could not perform well in practical applications of their pragmatic knowledge.

Key Words: *EFL, instructional pragmatics, practicum, pragmatic awareness, teacher trainee.*

¹ Lecturer at Uludağ University, Turkey E-mail: metuy76@ gmail.com

² Research Assistant at Uludağ University, Turkey. E-mail: ebruadamar@gmail.com

Introduction

With its simplest meaning, pragmatics is the rules of interaction which is culturally determined by native speakers of the target language. The examples of its theoretical content are met as deixis, politeness theory, speech acts, performative hypothesis, conversational maxims and implicatures, indirectness, etc. in the content of pragmatics course. During the course, all is given as an exposure opportunity to the target language and to guide the students to an understanding ‘the gap between their use of the target language and that of proficient language users’ or native speakers (Polovna, 2012: 149) and done to achieve pragmatics awareness.

The pragmatic awareness is one of the inevitable aspect of communicative competence, which sets off hard tasks for learners in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts due to the limited sources of target language in contexts. All the efforts spend for the pragmatic awareness is to develop the ‘pragmatic ability’ in the target language. It is somehow to be able to negotiate what is beyond the literal meaning addressing the intended meaning, and assumptions (Cohen, 2010). The importance of it in communication has always been a crucial aspect in language classes. Until recently, it was theoretically seen as one of the components of communicative competence and a pre-requisite for the ‘good command of English’. However, the recent cognition about pragmatics has led to an interest in including pragmatics in language teaching/training in practical manner rather than only theory (Sachtleben & Denny, 2012). As Bardovi-Harlig (1999) states that more emphasis is needed to enhance pragmatic awareness and use in the classroom since it has complex nature unlike other segments of language /grammar. In other words, pragmatic awareness necessitates the knowledge and competence of both socio-pragmatic norms and pragma-linguistic norms of the language (Yates, 2004). To examine the development of these norms in language learners, there are research attempts in the related fields to identify these complex structures due to the unfamiliar cultural variables for a language learner. When the related literature is investigated, there is much research investigating generally either the EFL learners’ awareness on the issue at the theoretical level or the availability and appropriateness of the teaching materials for pragmatic instruction (Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor, 2003; Basturkmen, 2007; İstifçi, 2009; Jie, 2005; Karatepe, 2001; Özyıldırım, 2010; Povolna, 2012; Uso-Juan, 2007; Yates, 2008). On the other hand, there is little research examining the pragmatic awareness of teachers and teacher trainees and its reflection in classroom settings (Cohen, Denny and Baştürkmen, 2011; Ishihara, 2011; Sachtleben and Denny, 2012)

As they are the primary source of the appropriate language, classroom practitioners’ pragmatic awareness and competence gain more importance. Glasgow (2008: 6-7) proposes that an L2 teacher with metapragmatic awareness be able to:

- 1) fashion student awareness of how to effectively strategize their approaches in conversation,
- 2) realize speech acts with the proper pragmalinguistic forms.
- 3) provide students with a larger sense of what’s “sayable” depending on the context.
- 4) give students access to choices, as Verschueren (1999) would put it, and allowing students to decide what choices would be best.
- 5) allow the opportunity for trial and error, especially in EFL, given the fact that few chances exist for many EFL students to interact outside the language school context.
- 6) develop in students the ability to self-monitor their pragmatic development. Students will ask “what should I say in this situation?”

This question allows the teacher to take advantage of accessing students to variations in the language that may serve student needs or work against students’ needs, both types of information proving as useful for students to know, or allowing them to discover this autonomously.

The accomplishment of meta-pragmatic awareness is not certainly an easy task. However, it is crucial to know ‘what’, ‘how’ and ‘in what ways’ the pragmatic knowledge can be enhanced. Not only the awareness and competence, but also the implementation of pragmatically appropriate language in the classroom has vital importance. Here, there becomes a need for an in-depth look to the training programs. The relevant research evaluating the involvement of pragmatics in teacher education programs often focus on theory rather than holding practical purposes (Eslami-Rasekh, 2005; Ishihara, 2011; Vásquez & Sharpless, 2009). As Ishihara and Cohen (2010) state, the relevant research would examine how prepared language teachers are to provide pragmatics instruction and how we integrate pragmatics into teacher education. Moreover, it should incorporate theoretical knowledge with the practical ones, that is to say converting pragmatics into instructional or instructed pragmatics. According to the results of Polovna’s study (2012), which is asking suggestions of teacher trainees about pragmatics teaching, teacher trainees are eager to implement most of their theoretical knowledge in their own teaching and they are also willing to improve pragmatic awareness of their students to enhancing their speaking skills, thus communicative competence.

With this starting point, such an awareness and desire on the issue of communicative competence through pragmatics lead us to examine what is being held in pre-service settings and what its reflection in classroom settings. From this aspect, to the authors’ knowledge, the current study is one of the first to inquire about what is known about pragmatics by EFL teacher trainees and what is their practical attempts in the practicum process to see their readiness on the issue. For this purpose in mind, the current study aims to investigate teacher trainees’ pragmatic awareness, their use of pragmatics during the practicum period and their reflections on it. It is hoped that the results would shed some light on future decisions to improve pragmatics course such as providing pre-service training on instructional pragmatics or re-examining the requirements for instructional pragmatics in teaching practice. A survey type research design is used in the study to find answers to the following research questions:

1. Are EFL teacher trainees aware of pragmatic features of the language that they are going to be teaching in the future?
2. What are their strengths and weaknesses and the problems they faced during their teaching practices with regard to pragmatic features?
3. Are teacher trainees capable of planning and implementing a pragmatically-focused lesson to raise pragmatic awareness of EFL learners?

Method

The present qualitative study investigates the level of pragmatic awareness of fourth year EFL teacher trainees and whether they are able to transfer their pragmatic knowledge into their teaching practices and, if not, to reveal their obstacles that they face during their instructional pragmatics applications.

Participants

The participants of the present study were 30 4th year EFL teacher trainees studying at ELT Department in a public university. 19 of the participants were female and 11 of them were male. Their ages were between 21-24. All of the participants have taken an elective *Pragmatics* course in the eighth semester aiming to improve teacher trainees’ pragmatic knowledge. The Pragmatics course is a theoretical one, the content of which focuses on

definitions, speech act theory, performative hypothesis, conversational maxims and implicatures, and indirectness and politeness theories.

Instruments

The data for the present study were collected through a questionnaire in the form of discourse completion task (DCT). The DCT was formed by analyzing different relevant research instruments by the researchers (Özyıldırım, 2010; Jie, 2005; Kılıçkaya, 2010; Nureddeen, 2008; Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Gürsoy, 2011; İstifçi, 2009). Then, it was administered to the teacher trainees before they started their practicum to investigate their awareness of the knowledge of pragmatics. The DCT consisted of 24 situations, 12 request and 12 apology situations, designed according to the variables of *social distance*, *power* and *size of imposition* (Brown and Levinson, 1987; Thomas, 1995). The situations were adapted from the previous studies with regard to the variables mentioned (see Appendix A). Social Distance is given as SD+ if the speaker and the hearer are socially distant and SD-, if they are intimates. The variable power is illustrated in three versions: P+, if the speaker has power over the hearer, P=; if they are equals, and P-; if the hearer has power over the speaker. The last variable covered in the study is size of imposition which is given as SI+ when the imposition is high, and SI-, when the imposition is low.

The responses were analysed according to their appropriateness in that specific situation based on the strategy choice of teacher trainees (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper, 1989) considering the variables of social distance between the speaker and the hearer, the relative power between them and the size of imposition placed on the hearer (i.e. how great the request you are making is or how great is your fault is in that apology situation).

The second instrument of the study was the reflection papers written by the teacher trainees. During the practicum process, 15 teacher trainees were requested to write reflection papers about their strengths and weaknesses with regard to pragmatic issues in their actual teaching process. 14 of the teacher trainees wrote 6 reflection papers each week and 84 reflection papers in total were gathered.

Besides, 10 teacher trainees were interviewed about their teaching pragmatics experiences and the discourse they used in their teaching experiences to get in-depth information about the contextual problems they faced.

Also, the teacher trainees planned and practised a specific lesson focusing on some pragmatic features (mostly on speech acts) and wrote their reflections in that specific lesson. While they were practising this specific 40-minute-lesson, the teacher trainees were observed by one of the researchers and their teaching was observed and evaluated in the framework of teaching pragmatics.

Results and Discussion

This section will provide the results and discussion of the present study based on the DCT results for the teacher trainees' pragmatic awareness, the reflection papers they have written about their practiced lessons and the results of the observations related to the specific lessons they performed on pragmatic features and finally the interview findings of the teacher trainees for their classroom practices in general.

The DCT

As mentioned earlier, the DCT had 24 situations (12 request and 12 apology) at varying degrees of social distance (SD), power (P), and size of imposition (SI) (Brown and Levinson, 1987; Thomas, 1995). The responses to the request situations were analysed according to their appropriateness in that specific situation based on their level of directness and apology situations based on the IFID (illocutionary force indicating device) and other four apology strategies considering the variables of social distance between the speaker and the hearer, the relative power between them and the size of imposition placed on the hearer (i.e. how great the request you are making is or how great is your fault is in that apology situation) (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Blum-Kulka, *et al.*, 1989).

Responses to Request Situations

Twelve (2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, and 24) of the situations in the DCT were request situations designed according to Power (P), Social Distance (SD), and Size of Imposition (SI) as described by Brown and Levinson (1987) and Thomas (1995). The request responses were analysed according to the nine indirectness strategies presented in CCSARP (Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realisation Project) (Blum-Kulka, *et al.* 1989).

Totally 360 (30x12) request responses were gathered from the teacher trainees for the request situations in the DCT. When the responses were evaluated, it is observed that most of the responses of the teacher trainees (n=302; 83%) were appropriate according to the given situations. Teacher trainees' choice of requesting strategies are appropriate for the given situations (see Appendix B). They are aware of the requesting strategies depending on the situational factors. In the situations where social distance is high, they employ conventionally indirect strategies (mostly *query preparatory* strategy with *would/could + please*). This also shows that teacher trainees are aware of politeness and formality as they prefer *would/could* rather than *can/will/may* in their responses. Similarly, when power is equal, teacher trainees used conventionally indirect strategies, but this time with mostly *can*, where few occurrences are observed with *may* and *will*, which can be considered as an indication of awareness of being informal and sincere in such situations. The responses for the third example situation illustrates the use of conventionally indirect forms with more direct and informal modals like *can*. However, in this situation teacher trainees used *please* in almost all responses because it is a formal situation and requires more politeness whereas in the former situation most of them have not used *please* in their responses as it does not require much formality. Thus, considering the results, it can be concluded that teacher trainees participated in the study are aware of making appropriate requests considering the situational factors which affect the preferred strategies and linguistic devices for request realizations. In sum, they seem to have pragmatic awareness of the request realizations with regard to the strategy choice, politeness and formality considering the variations of the situational factors.

Responses to Apology Situations

The number of apology situations were twelve (1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, and 23) in the DCT administered to the teacher trainees. Similar to the request situations, the apology situations designed according to Power (P), Social Distance (SD), and Size of Imposition (SI) as described by Brown and Levinson (1987) and Thomas (1995).

As mentioned by Blum-Kulka & Olshtain (1984) apologizing differs from requesting because "apologies are generally *post-event acts*", however, "requests are always *pre-event acts*" (p.206). Thus, "apologies involve loss of face for the speaker and support for the hearer, while requests might involve loss of face for both interlocutors" (p. 206).

The linguistic realization of the act of apologizing can take one of two basic forms, or a combination of both (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984: 20&):

- a. The most direct realization of an apology is done via an explicit illocutionary force indicating device (IFID) like *apologise, (be) sorry, excuse, pardon, or forgive*.
- b. Another way in which one can apologise (with or without an IFID) is using an utterance including reference to one or more elements from a closed set of specified propositions. An utterance which relates to: (a) the cause for the apology (explanation); (b) Taking responsibility for the fault (c) willingness to offer repairs for the fault or (d) promise forbearance (that it will never happen again) can be used as an apology by the speakers (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984).

Thus, the apology responses were evaluated according to the strategies above. There were 360 (30x12) apology responses gathered from the teacher trainees in total, 290 (79%) of which can be considered as appropriate according to the given situations (see Appendix B). When the apology responses were evaluated it can be said that the teacher trainees use appropriate apologising strategies depending on the situational factors mentioned earlier. For example, in S3 most of the teacher trainees provided an *explanation or account of cause* (n=26) with an IFID mostly *(be) sorry* for the apology. This may be because they cannot include the other strategies as there may not be an *offer of repair* or *promise in that situation*. In S7 as the SI is low, teacher trainees responded in a direct way with only an IFID, however 3 of the trainees gave a response indicating *denial of the fault* (response no.8, 9, &10) which can be a strategy used by native speakers in such situations (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984). Also, teacher trainees used the strategy of *offer of repair* appropriately in the given situations. Responses to S19 illustrate that only two of the teacher trainees have not used this strategy whereas the rest of the group used the strategies and were able to distinguish between the situational factors and create the appropriate apology responses to the situations. The last response samples also support the conclusion that teacher trainees create conventional apologies for the given situations. They used the conventional strategies of *explanation or account of cause* accompanied by an IFID as the reason of being late is the traffic and *promise of forbearance* which a great number of teacher trainees provided in their responses (n=28 and n= 19, respectively). These findings also suggest that the teacher trainees seem to distinguish between politeness and formality as people in this situation are socially distant and the hearer has power over the speaker.

In conclusion, the teacher trainees participated in the study seem to be aware of making appropriate requests and apologies considering the situational factors which affect the preferred strategies and linguistic devices for the realization of these pragmatic features which may signal that teacher trainees have pragmatic awareness in the target language in general.

Reflection Papers and Interviews

In order to understand whether the teacher trainees were able to adapt their pragmatic knowledge into the teaching practice, reflection papers were gathered. In these reflection papers, strengths and weaknesses with regard to pragmatic issues in actual teaching process were written. Totally 84 reflection papers were evaluated for the second phase of the study. To support the results of the reflection papers, 10 of the teacher trainees were interviewed about their teaching pragmatics experiences and the discourse they used in their teaching experiences to get in-depth information about the contextual problems they faced.

Of 38 of the 84 (45%) reflection papers teacher trainees made no explicit reference to the strengths and weaknesses in their pragmatic applications. In the remaining 38 papers, it is observed that teacher trainees feel safer when teaching grammar subjects, reading or vocabulary. The quotations below are examples from teacher trainees' reflection papers:

“... Students took part in the lesson. They answered the questions but they had difficulty in speaking part. They understood grammar part with the help of visuals and power point. They can recognise and use comparative adjectives. I sometimes had difficulty in controlling students..”

“I prepared well and gave the rules clearly and we made some exercises together. They could understand the difference between will and going to and they could talk about their predictions, future plans, and intentions.”

“The topic was type zero. The context was superstition. This lesson was the most enjoyable. All students took part in the lesson. But some students made grammar mistakes. They forgot to add s' suffix when they used 'he, she, it'. I gave feedback when they made mistakes....”

“It was an enjoyable lesson because they were interested in places that we talked about. They liked the photos that we used in class. The reading passage was interesting and they understood the passage and answered the comprehension questions correctly.”

The above quotations support Glasgow's (2008) claim that “teachers have depended overwhelmingly on grammar as an area in which to correct learners, perhaps because it is such a salient feature.” (p.12). However, as Glasgow (2008) suggests teachers are to relate key grammatical points to sociocultural and situational contexts to establish pragmatic awareness considering language appropriacy. Thus, teachers should make salient the input provided through key grammatical features and make connections between these features and the "social process" (Ventola, 1984). Thus, learners will be able to link context to form, and understand how language is realized socially (Glasgow, 2008). With these in mind, it can be suggested that both pragmatic knowledge and grammatical awareness must be mastered by the language teachers particularly when oral production and comprehension are emphasised (Glasgow, 2008).

From the 84 reflection papers, 46 (55%) of them mentioned about their pragmatic applications in the classroom. They provided information about the topic, its relation to pragmatics, and whether they felt successful and satisfied with that specific lesson. Below are some instances from teacher trainees:

“Today I taught talking about hobbies and giving comments about hobbies. When I was focusing on the reading comprehension questions and grammar it was fine but in pragmatic aspect of the lesson I mean when they were preparing a dialog I couldn't make them write appropriate utterances while making suggestions. It couldn't be a completely effective lesson. I couldn't get what I wanted ...”

“All I wanted was to have the students interact and be able to ask for permission. But it was difficult to explain the differences between can, could and would in asking for permission. Maybe I have to study more about teaching pragmatic features of the language.”

“I focused on some structures like How about opening the door?, Why don't you open the window?. These are suggestions so I wrote some situations starting “suggest your friend to go to the cinema/concert/picnic/swimming, etc. It was not an enjoyable lesson.”

“Students got bored sometimes. Because the activities were full of writing skills. They had difficulty in dialogues and pragmatic perspectives of lesson. I couldn't explain the differences between advising structures ...”

As it can be understood from teacher trainees' reflection papers, they felt unsuccessful while teaching pragmatics. Only 9 (21%) of the 46 reflection papers

indicated positive reflections for their pragmatic applications in the classroom. One example is as follows:

“This lesson was ideal for pragmatics use of language. While students were learning use of different kinds of notes, they were concentrating on real-life situations. Accepting an invitation, writing a phone message, a message of sympathy, a thank you note and a message of congratulation required students to know and use phrases that they need in real life situations. When they learned use of phrases they are learning will help them outside and they will have a good communication competence with people, they concentrated on lesson. Practicing of phrases also helped them to learn the differences between them. I sometimes showed them the similarities between their native and target language so as to they can I understand clearly. When it was hard for me to show pragmatics use of phrases, I tried to create a context and teach them.”

During the interviews, teacher trainees were asked to how they taught pragmatic features and what their difficulties are when teaching pragmatic features of the language. 70% of trainees who were interviewed commented on the gap between theoretical and practical pragmatics in the program. Two of the comments on teaching pragmatics are as follows:

“I had pragmatics course last semester and I learned about the varieties in making requests or suggestions, I mean, some speech acts, but when I was teaching it was very difficult for me to do this.”

“...when we were having pragmatics course, I thought that it was just a subject area of linguistics, but when I was preparing for the lessons, I thought that it is a part of the classroom practice....”

These opinions indicate the importance and necessity of instructional pragmatics in EFL teacher education programs (Bardovi-Harlig, 1992; Biesenback-Lucas, 2003; Eslami-Rasekh, 2005; Karatepe, 1998; Karatepe, 2001; Vasquez & Sharpless, 2009). Knowledge of Pragmatics may not be sufficient for teaching pragmatics. Teachers must also be informed about ways of addressing particular information and ensure learner comprehension related to pragmatic information (Glasgow, 2008). Kasper (1997) said that opportunities for pragmatic knowledge to be conveyed to the students have to be facilitated in the classroom in order for pragmatic knowledge to be conveyed. Again, to do this, the need for and inclusion of instructional pragmatics in teacher education programs must be emphasized. Vasquez and Sharpless (2009) have found that in U.S.TESOL education programs only 20% of MA TESOL programs in the U.S. had a course dedicated to pragmatics, more than half of which were reported having a theoretical rather than practical focus. As Ishihara (2010) states, the current situation in EFL contexts, countries like Turkey, could be more limited. Thus, the integration of instructional pragmatics courses is urgent in teacher education programs.

Lessons Planned for Teaching Pragmatics

The participating teacher trainees (n=14) were requested to plan and practise a specific lesson focusing on some pragmatic features and wrote their reflections and difficulties they had in that specific lesson. While they were practising this specific 40-minutes-lesson, the teacher trainees were observed by one of the researchers within the framework of teaching pragmatics.

During observations it is understood that only two of the teacher trainees (14%) were successful in planning and practicing a pragmatics-focused lesson. Both of them focused on teaching the speech act of requesting. One of them preferred the way of presenting explicitly

whereas the other followed an inductive process. They illustrated the differences between requesting strategies based on the situational factors. Especially the explicit teaching version was more planned and successful as the researcher observed in that the learners become more aware of the strategic differences with regard to sincerity, authority, or how great the request is. Different situations were presented by a video and teacher focused their attention to the different request utterances and made the learners find the situational variations by eliciting answers from the learners during presentation. Then, in the practice part, she gave different situations and wanted them to write request-answer exchanges and followed by a discussion of the reasons of their choices.

On the other hand, three of the teacher trainees (21%) was not able to plan a lesson for teaching pragmatic features. Two of them were speaking lessons related to “Turkish cuisine” and “Facebook”. Teacher trainees who planned these lessons seem to be lacking the pragmatic knowledge as well as putting it into practice. When they were asked the reason for doing so, they stated that their pragmatic knowledge was vague and they were not accustomed to prepare a lesson plan focusing on teaching pragmatics.

The rest of the teacher trainees (65%, n=9) planned lessons focusing on speech acts like, requesting (2), suggestions (2), invitations & refusals (2), offering (2), and advising (1). When the plans were evaluated and lessons were observed, it can be concluded that even the teacher trainees have pragmatic awareness in general, they were unable to transfer their pragmatic knowledge in their practical applications. They did not pay attention to teaching situational variations. Most of their focus was based on the conventional uses of that speech act, for instance:

“....(Teacher presented a video.)

...

S: ‘Can you come to my birthday party?’

T: Yes, you are right. She says ‘Can you come to my birthday party?’ (The teacher writes it on the board.) Do you think it is polite enough for an invitation?

S: No/Yes.

T: Then let’s see some other ways to invite people to somewhere.

(She starts the presentation.)

PRESENTATION: At this stage;

(The teacher starts the presentation and tells the structure and gives some examples from the presentation to the students.)

PRACTISE: At this stage;

T: Now, I have a worksheet for you. Please fill in the blanks with ‘would you like ...’ and give the suitable answer if it is positive or negative.

(The students fill in the gaps and the teacher waits for them.)

T: Let’s fill in the blanks together. Who wants to do the first?

....”

“.....

T: Now we will read a text about **DIETS AND HEALTH**. (**Reading passage is verso.**) please read the text silently. Then we read it loudly. Underline the unknown words. (**then the teacher chooses a student and the student reads the text.**)

T: let’s answer the questions. The first question ‘what must we have to be strong and fit?’

S: we should eat the right kinds of food everyday.

T: Why do we eat fresh fruit and vegetables?

S: ... (**the exercise lasts on like this, after the students answer the question, firstly the teacher explains should/shouldn’t, then teacher ask the students to make sentences with should/ shouldn’t.**)

T: we use **should** to give an advice. We use **should** to express what we think is good or right to do, to ask for or give an opinion about something and to express that something and to express that something is not right or not what we expect.

...”

Similar lesson plans and procedures were identified with reflections of having difficulty in achieving goals set before the lessons without creating real life context with varied degrees of intimacy or authority, or politeness and formality. The teacher trainees' lessons were similar to the presentation of current coursebooks which focus only on conventional forms like "would you/could you/can you/may I?" when presenting requests.

These findings illustrate that teacher trainees' pragmatic awareness seem to remain at the theoretical level. As they have not presented the pragmatic features explicitly in their lessons with regard to situational factors and politeness, directness or formality issues, raising pragmatic awareness of language learners will be threatened. House (1996) demonstrates how, through, explicit metapragmatic instruction, the development of metapragmatic awareness developed student fluency in the target language. Glasgow (2008) also applied such approaches in his own teaching, and observed its immediate results in learners' performances.

Conclusion

To sum up, the present study aims to investigate teacher trainees' pragmatic awareness and their reflections with regard to their pragmatic applications in the classroom during their teaching practices. The results of the DCT indicated that teacher trainees have pragmatic awareness in general, however, their comments gathered from the reflection papers and interviews revealed that their awareness was mostly on theoretical pragmatic knowledge. When their reflections were analysed it was clearly seen that EFL teacher trainees could not perform well in practical applications of their pragmatic knowledge. Their lesson plans and the reflective comments also resulted in similar findings.

Despite publications on pragmatic instruction have increased in recent years (e.g., Ishihara & Cohen 2010, Tatsuki & Houck 2010, Povolna, 2012; O-Keeffe, Adolphs & Clancy, 2011), teaching resources are still poor in raising understanding of the cultural variances that dramatically affect pragmatic awareness (Rasekh-Eslami, 2011). Moreover, most of the studies related to pragmatics has investigated the pragmatic competence of EFL learners in general, the competency and awareness of teacher trainees and practicing teachers need to be focused in further studies. A study by Povolna (2012) focusing on instructional pragmatics revealed that teacher trainees benefit from the study of pragmatics and are ready to apply most of their theoretical knowledge as well as practical skills in their own teaching. Both referring to Povolna (2012) and drawing on the conclusions of the present study, the teacher trainees' need for instructional and practical pragmatics instruction came out loud as an outcome of the research study. As a conclusion, the current research reveals insights for more practical pragmatics instruction and suggestions for curriculum development for EFL teacher education.

References

- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1992). Pragmatics as part of teacher education. *TESOL Journal*, 1, 28 – 32 .
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Mahan-Taylor, R. (2003). *Teaching pragmatics* [Online]. Retrieved from <http://exchanges.state.gov/education/engteaching/pragmatics.htm>
- Basturkmen, H. (2007). Signalling the relationship between ideas in academic speaking: From language description to pedagogy. *Prospect*, 22(2), 61-71.
- Biesenback-Lucas, S. (2003). Preparing students for the pragmatics of e-mail interaction in academia: A new/forgotten dimension in teacher education. *Teacher Education Interest Section Newsletter*, 18(2), 3 – 4 .
- Blum-Kulka, S. and Olshtain, S.E. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics*. 5 (3), 196 – 213 .
- Cohen, A. (2010) Coming to terms with pragmatics In N. Ishihara & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), *Teaching and Learning Pragmatics: Where Language and Culture Meet* (3 – 21). Malaysia: Pearson Education.
- Ellis, R. (1994). Pragmatic aspects of learner language. In, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Eslami-Rasekh, Z. (2005). Raising pragmatic awareness of language learners. *ELT Journal* 59, 199-208.
- Glasgow, G (2008). Language awareness, metapragmatics and the L2 Teacher. *Accents Asia* [Online], 2 (2), 1-16. Available: <http://www.accentsasia.org/2-2/glasgowg.pdf>
- Gürsoy, E. (2011). The effect of textbooks on ELT trainees' use of pragmalinguistic features. *Novitas-ROYAL*. 5.(2), 247 – 264 .
- House, J. (1996). Developing pragmatic fluency in English as a foreign language: Routines and metapragmatic awareness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18, 225 – 252.
- Ishihara N. (2010). Assessment of Pragmatics in the classroom. In N. Ishihara & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), *Teaching and Learning Pragmatics: Where Language and Culture Meet* (286-317). Malaysia: Pearson Education.
- İstifçi, İ. (2009). The use of apologies by EFL learners. *English Language Teaching*. 2 (3). 15 – 25.
- Jie, C. (2005). A Comparative Study of Chinese EFL Learners' Performances in Different Pragmatic Tests. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. Available online at: <http://www.cxrlinguistics.com/UploadFile/201191983513522.pdf>
- Karatepe, Ç. (1998). Teaching pragmalinguistics in teacher training programs. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK.
- Karatepe, Ç. (2001). Pragmalinguistic awareness in EFL teacher training. *Language Awareness*, 2(3), 178 – 188.
- Kasper, G. (1990). Linguistic politeness: Current research issues. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 193 – 218 .

- Kasper, G. (1997) The role of pragmatics in language teacher education, In K. Bardovi-Harlig and B. Hartford (eds), *Beyond methods: Components of second language education* (113–36). New York: McGraw-Hill Company.
- Kılıçkaya, F. (2010) The Pragmatic Knowledge of Turkish EFL Students in Using Certain Request Strategies. *Gaziantep Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. 9 (1), 185 – 201.
- Koike, D. & Pearson, L. (2005). The Effect of Instruction and Feedback in the Development of Pragmatic Competence. *System*, 33, 481 – 501 .
- Nureddeen, F. A. (2008). Cross cultural pragmatics: Apology strategies in Sudanese Arabic. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 40, 279–306.
- O’Keeffe, A., Clancy, B. and Adolphs, S. 2011. *Introducing Pragmatics in Use*. London: Routledge.
- Özyıldırım, I. (2010). The Level of Directness in Turkish Apology Forms in Relation to the Level of Education. *Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi / Journal of Faculty of Letters EFD/JFL*. 27 (1). 179 – 201.
- Povolna, R. (2012). Pragmatic awareness in teacher education. *Acta academica karviniensia, Karviná: Slezská univerzita v Opavě, Obchodně podnikatelská fakulta v Karviné*, 12/1, 148 – 158.
- Rose, K. & Kasper, G. (2001). *Pragmatics in Language Teaching*. USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Sachtleben, A. & Denny, H.G., (2012). Making the implicit explicit: raising pragmatic awareness in trainee interpreters, using semi-authentic spontaneous discourse samples *TESOL Journal*, 3(1), 126 – 137.
- Tatsuki, D. H., & Houck, N. R. (2010). Pragmatics from research to practice: Teaching speech acts. In D. H. Tatsuki and N. R. Houck (Eds.), *Pragmatics: Teaching speech acts* (1 – 6) . Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Thomas, J. (1995) *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Uso-Juan, E. (2007). *The presentation and practice of the communicative act of requesting in textbooks: Focusing on modifiers*. In Soler, E. A. and Jorda, M. P. S. (Eds.) *Intercultural language use and language learning*. Netherlands: Springer.
- Vásquez, C., and Sharpless, D. (2009) The role of pragmatics in the master’s TESOL curriculum: Findings from a nationwide survey. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(1), 5–28.
- Yates, L. (2004). The secret rules of language. *Prospect*, 19(1), 3 – 21.
- Yates, L. (2008). *Teaching in Action 3. The not-so generic skills: Teaching employability communication skills to adult migrants*. Sydney, Australia: Adult Migrant English Programme Research Centre.

Appendix A

The distribution of situations and contextual factors

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Social Distance (SD)</u>	<u>Power (P)</u>	<u>Size of Imposition (SI)</u>	<u>Requests(R) /Apology (A)</u>
1.	SD+	P+	SI+	A
2.	SD+	P-	SI+	R
3.	SD+	P+	SI-	A
4.	SD-	P-	SI+	R
5.	SD+	P=	SI+	A
6.	SD+	P+	SI-	R
7.	SD+	P=	SI-	A
8.	SD-	P+	SI+	R
9.	SD-	P+	SI+	A
10.	SD+	P=	SI+	R
11.	SD-	P+	S -	A
12.	SD-	P-	SI-	R
13.	SD-	P-	SI+	A
14.	SD-	P=	SI-	R
15.	SD-	P-	SI-	A
16.	SD+	P+	SI+	R
17.	SD-	P=	SI-	A
18.	SD+	P=	SI-	R
19.	SD-	P=	SI+	A
20.	SD+	P-	SI-	R
21.	SD+	P-	SI-	A
22.	SD-	P+	SI -	R
23.	SD+	P-	SI+	A
24.	SD-	P=	SI+	R

Appendix B

Examples from the request situations and given responses

Requests

S2: SD+ P- SI+

Your term paper is due, but you haven't finished it yet. You want to ask your professor for an extension.

What would you say?

1. *Professor, unfortunately, I haven't still finished it. Could you give me an extra day, please?*
2. *I think I need some more time for my paper. It hasn't finished yet. Would you mind if I bring it in few day, please?*
3. *I tried hard but couldn't finish it yet Sir, can I give it tomorrow, please?*
4. *Sir, would you mind if I gave my term paper a week later? I haven't finish my term paper yet.*

S14: SD- P= SI-

You're studying for your exam next day, it's 10:00p.m. and you are hungry. You have a neighbor next door who is close to your age and that you like. You know that she/he is still awake. You want ask for a piece of bread. How would you request it?

1. *Sorry for bothering you, I need a piece of bread, Have you got some?*
2. *Will you give me a piece of bread?*
3. *Can I have piece of bread? I haven't got any.*

S22: SD- P+ SI –

You are working as a manager in a company and you have some reports to be e-mailed to the boss in 5 minutes. You are making an important phone call so you want this from one of the personnel that you are close with. What would you say?

1. *I have an important call. Can you please send these reports to the boss?*
2. *Can you e-mail the report to the boss, please?*
3. *Hey John I am making an important phone call please send those e-mails to the boss in 5 mins.*

Apologies

S3: SD+ P+ SI-

As an English teacher, you're the head of the department in a private school. You're supposed to interview an English teacher for a position, but you had been called to an unexpected meeting in another place, therefore, he arrived at his office half an hour late.

The secretary: This is Miss Soysal, English teacher. She has been waiting for you for half an hour.

1. *I'm sorry for being late. I had an unexpected meeting in a place. Let's start the interview.*
2. *I apologise to you for being late.*
3. *I'm sorry for being late. If I'd known the meeting before I would have informed you.*

S7: SD+ P= SI-

You stepped on the foot of a woman slightly while you were trying to sit down; but it was impossible to avoid this as the woman extended her legs too much towards the front seat. Still, you felt the need to apologize. The woman: "Ah! Be careful!"

1. *I'm sorry, I couldn't notice.*
2. *Sorry, This is my fault.*
3. *Sorry but you shouldn't extend your legs too much.*

S19: SD- P= SI+

Ozan and Mert are friends. Ozan borrowed Mert's computer. But while he was using the computer, he dropped it and damaged the screen of the computer. Ozan is returning the computer to his friend.

Mert: I hope you are OK! What happened?

1. *I was writing my homework, it suddenly dropped. I am sorry. I will pay for it.*
2. *I'm very sorry that I damaged the computer but I can make up for it.*
3. *I'm sorry. I damaged your computer but I promise I can have it repaired for you*
4. *I apologise .I broke its screen, but I promise I'll get it repaired.*

S23. SD+ P- SI+

Zeynep applied for a job in a company and had an interview with the manager. She was caught in a traffic jam and arrived half an hour late. Now the secretary takes her into the manager's office.

The secretary: This is Zeynep Kalman.

The manager: You are here at last?

1. *I know it's very bad being late on the first meeting, but I have got reasonable excuse.*
2. *I'm so sorry to be late because I was caught in a traffic jam.*
3. *I apologize for being so late. But there was a huge traffic on the road. I promise it won't happen again.*
4. *I'm so sorry I promise not to be late again but I was stuck in a traffic jam.*