T. C.

ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

RAISING PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE

IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOMS

THESIS

Nadhim Othman Najmalddın NAJMALDDIN

Department of English Language and Literature

English Language and Literature Program

Thesis Advisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Turkay BULUT

February 2017

T.C.

ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

RAISING PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE

IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOMS

THESIS

Nadhim Othman Najmalddın NAJMALDDIN

Department of English Language and Literature

English Language and Literature Program

Thesis Advisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Turkay BULUT

February 2017

T.C.
İSTANBUL AYDIN ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ

Yüksek Lisans Tez Onay Belgesi

Enstitümüz İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Ana Bilim Dalı İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı Y1412.020021 numaralı öğrencisi **Nadhım Othman Najmalddın NAJMALDDIN**'in **"RAISING PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOMS"** adlı tez çalışması Enstitümüz Yönetim Kurulunun 30.09.2016 tarih ve 2016/20 sayılı kararıyla oluşturulan jüri tarafından *Oy Birliği* ile Tezli Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak *Kabul* edilmiştir.

<u>**Öğretim Üyesi Adı Soyadı**</u>   **İmzası**

Tez Savunma Tarihi :20/02/2017

1)Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Türkay BULUT

2) Jüri Üyesi   :   Doç. Dr. Gülru YÜKSEL

3) Jüri Üyesi   :   Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hülya YUMRU

Not: Öğrencinin Tez savunmasında **Başarılı** olması halinde bu form **imzalanacaktır.** Aksi halde geçersizdir.

DEDICATION

- To my lovely and supportive wife, Shaimaa.

- To my adorable son, Eyan

FOREWORD

November 2016   **NADHIM NAJMALDDIN**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

C	:Complement
CR	:Complement Responses
EFL	:English as a Foreign Language
ESL	:English as a Second Language
GPA	:Grade Point Average
L2	:Second Language
SPSS	:Statistical Package for Social Sciences
WCDT	:Written Completion Discourse Task

LIST OF TABLES

YABANCI DİL SINIFLARINDA PRAGMATIC KABILIYETININ YÜKSELTILMESİ

ÖZET

Son zamanlarda ikinci dil pragmatigi , ikinci dil öğretim alanında önemli bir konu haline gelmiştir. Son zamanlarda progmatik eğitim ile alakali Neden? Nasıl? Ve Ne?, açılardan progmatık eğitim konusunda sahıb oldugu kabıliyet ile ilgili bir çok araştırmalar yapılmıştır, ama hala çözülmemiş noktalar mevcuttur. Bu araştırma EFL siniflardan pragmatik kabiliyetinin geliştirme olasılığı hakında konuşuyor, aynı zamanda bu araştırma İngilizce öğrenen öğrencilrin hızlı pragmatik kullanmasında dil kabiliyetlerinin etkisini inceliyor. üniversite son sınıfından, inglizceleri üst düzeyde olan, 50 öğrenci (25 erkek 25 kız) üniversite öğrencileri kursa katildi, ilk başta bilgi elde etme amacindan önce ön sınava katıldılar ve kursun sonunda da art sınava katıldılar. Bu araştırma birkaç önemli sorulari hitabi ediyor, bunlarin arasindan pragmatik kabiliyetin gelişmesyile dil kabilyetin arasındaki ilişki, pragmatik kabiliyeti yükseltmede sınıf içerisindeki programın etkisi, pragmatik kabiliyetinin cinsiyetin rolu üzerinde faktör olarak etkisi nedir? önceki araştırmaların aksinde, bu araştırma pragmatik kullanmanın bir yönünden fazla yönleri içeriyor. Bunlara dahil olmak üzere çikarim, içerme, anlam ve çeviride yapısal hatalar ve konuşma eylemi (istek, ret, özür ve teklif). Yapılan araştirma sonucunda belli noktalara ulaşılmıştır, yapilan incelemelerde pragmatik kabiliyeti dil öğretim geliştirmesine ve bilgilendşrmesinde yardimci oluyor. Dil seviyesi pragmatik becerikliği üzerinde önemli olçüde etkisi var, pragmatik üzerinde yazilan müfredatlar kabilyet kurmasinda yardimci oluyor, Pragmatik öğrenmede cinsiyetin etkisi yoktur, yapilan art sinavlarda her iki cinsiyet ayni seviyeleri gösterdiler. Sonunda da pragmatik becerikliğin kabiliyeti sınıflara dayalı derselerle yükseltileceği bekleniyor.

Anahtar kelimeler: *Pragmatik kabiliyeti, müfredat, cinsiyet farklılığı, değerlendirmek, yabancı dil.*

RAISING PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOMS

ABSTRACT

Second language pragmatics has recently been a prevailing topic in the field of second language teaching. While many studies have been conducted about why, how and what to incorporate regarding the teaching of pragmatic competence, there are still unsolved issues about them. This study addresses the possibility of developing pragmatic competence in EFL classrooms through well-designed curricular courses. The study also examined the impact of proficiency in expediting pragmatic production in English L2 learners. Fifty senior university students (25 males; 25 females) with English high proficiency attended the course, participating in a pre-test before instruction began and a post-test upon course completion. The study addresses several significant questions, namely the relationship of proficiency and development of pragmatic competence, the impact of class-based explicit instruction in raising competence, and the role of gender as an influencing factor affecting competence. Unlike previous studies, this study covered more than one aspect of pragmatic production, including inference, implicatures, structural errors in meaning and interpretation, and speech act (requests, refusals, apology and offer). The study produced key findings that can help inform and improve the incorporating of pragmatic competence in language study; proficiency level significantly impacts pragmatic competence; pragmatic-based curricula are supportive in constructing competence; gender factor does not affect learning pragmatics, as both genders performed similarly in the tests. Eventually pragmatic competence can expectedly be raised via classrooms-based courses.

Keywords: *Pragmatic Competence, Curriculum, Gender Difference, Assessment,*

Foreign Language.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

Communication is the base-line definition of language production, and English has been the language of social media, scientific resources, studies and businesses. Good communication guarantees good comprehension, but the challenges that English L2 speakers face center on understanding the interlocutor's meaning which can simply be introduced as pragmatic competence.

Pragmatic competence is understood to be a central component of communicative competence (Bachman, 1990; Canale & Swain, 1980), and growing interests have been noted in addressing pragmatics in L2 curriculum as seen in the publication of educationally oriented articles (Crandall & Basturkmen, 2004). There have been various investigations on the validity and dependability of different ways for obtaining pragmatic comprehension and use (such as written and oral discourse completion tasks, multiple-choice tasks (MDCT), role-play self-assessment , role-play tasks, discourse self-assessment tasks) for L2 contexts (Brown, 2001; Cohen, 2004; Enochs & Yoshitake-Strain, 1999). Those assessing tools are mostly executed with well-trained raters under empirical status.

Studies on the pragmatic competence of adult second language students have determined that mastering grammatical aspect of language does not necessarily ensure effective mastery of the pragmatic aspect of language (Bardovi-Harlig and Do¨rnyei, 1997). Furthermore, the advanced students may not have the capability to comprehend or convey the intended messages and take into consideration the level of informality or formality of the situation. It is teachers' duty to effectively train learners to use language pragmatically in the correct manner. On the other hand, language teachers face difficulties in imparting such contextual knowledge. Challenges include the absence of sufficient teaching and learning resources and coaching for teachers. The previous

challenges stemmed from the absence of giving priority to solve pragmatic problems in the methodology of EFL (L2) teaching. This thesis aims to examine the practicability of instructing pragmatics to English Language Learners. The study initially provides a comprehensive definition of pragmatic competence and continues to explore a number of methodological approaches employed in instructing pragmatic aspects of language. Lastly, the study focuses on several techniques for increasing the level of learners' pragmatic understanding.

1.2 The Problem of the Study

Studies on pragmatic competence came up with different and sometimes contradictory findings; some claim that pragmatic competence is acquired, and not learned, while other researchers support the idea that pragmatic competence is teachable, particularly in regard to speech acts approaches. There are still disputes about the impact of classroom-based instruction to develop competence; however, recent studies hypothesize that the teaching environment can contribute to learners building pragmatic competence if they have high English proficiency. Classroom-based pragmatic development would expectedly encounter problems that require further efforts to solve. The problems that researchers of pragmatic competence have faced include lack of classroom-based teaching curriculum; there have not been so many resources to use for pragmatic competence. Thus, various methods should be tried in hope of finding what the best tools are to develop competence. The study will concentrate on few issues in the field of pragmatic competence such as the variability of proficiency of English L2 learners which is counted as a barrier of acquiring competence in foreign language classrooms, gender difference is considered a factor influencing pragmatic competence and the influence of the length of English learning on developing competence.

1.3 The Aim of the Study

The study seeks to explore the possibility of classroom-based curriculum of pragmatic competence and the impact of instructors in fostering pragmatic competence. The research also aims to address the following short term objectives:

- Rating the impact of variation of English proficiency level on pragmatic competence as an individual difference.
- Proving the instructional and educational tools that can be applied in classrooms to increase pragmatic competence.
- Exhibiting the preferable assessment tools that L2 leaners recommend in their pragmatic competence evaluation.
- Identifying gaps in the existing literature and researches that should be considered as topics to be sought for in further researches.

1.4 The Research Questions

This research applies modern technologies and applications to explore the validity of the tests and tasks used in the evaluation of pragmatic competence. These assessment tools provide the researcher with accurate data and results that will provide assistance in approaching the questions of the study, as well as the readers' curiosity to get familiarity with the material and efforts that are applied in the current study. The study's research questions are:

1. Can classroom-based explicit instruction develop pragmatic competence?
2. Is there a relationship between L2 proficiency level and pragmatic competence?
3. Is gender a factor affecting the L2 pragmatic competence?

1.5 The Significance of the Study

This study will validate or contest previous studies that have been conducted about the class-based assessments in relation to pragmatic competence and teacher-based assessments. They particularly reported about the impact of a typical instructor who ran pragmatics based-curriculum and assess the participants' pragmatic competence through WDCT and self- assessment and role plays as in (Ishihara, 2009). This study focuses on the level of proficiency, the application of a certain curriculum and gender consideration as well as the duration of language learning that might affect the quality of pragmatic competence. Some researchers stated that gender is a factor that influences L2 acquisitions in a way or another (Block, 2002). In this study, students' gender will be

3

assessed as a crucial factor in learning pragmatic competence and explore whether gender's varying capacity can affect acquiring pragmatic competence via the data that will be collected from the tasks and tests. This would give this study a value among other impactful studies.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Historical Background

Recent studies have made initial efforts to produce constructional instruments in relation with introducing practical aspects to be suitable for classroom assessment, for example written DCT, role plays, discourse rating assignment and multiple choices for assessing pragmatic competence. Lee and McChesney (2000); Cohen (2004); Ishihara and Cohen (2010) and Ishihara (2009) studied different levels of learners' development of pragmatic competence through general developed classroom-based assignments and instruments which comprised rubrics for assessing pragmatic awareness and use as well as the awareness of meta-pragmatic such as reflection of the pragmatic norms that recently learnt, learner's self-assessment of pragmatic production and community interpretation, the assessments relying on the socio-cultural theory of Vygotsky and many other theories of teacher-based assessment. Other researchers employed ethnographic methods to discuss the ambiguity of pragmatic production the individual learners make and the curves of raising pragmatic in certain period of time (Jones, 2007).

According to a survey conducted in the United States of America in teacher education program, pragmatic integration of teacher program course in US, the pragmatic treatment can be based on the theory of speech acts and politeness rather than the practical application; this assumes that in case of giving theory, teachers are able to develop their own methods of pragmatic instruction; however teachers have various awareness levels of pragmatic rules and they are aware of the differences in L2 (Va´squez and Sharpless, 2009).

Fast development has been noted in developing pragmatic competence especially in the studies of interlanguage pragmatic that were conducted in the last few decades (Kasper & Roever, 2005; Cohen, 2008; Kasper, 2007).

Amongst the main questions some studies addressed are the causes of pragmatic rapid development and competence; namely language proficiency and years spent in the native language country are amongst the factors that explored before (R¨over, 2005; Dalmau & Gotor, 2007; F´elix-Brasdefer, 2003; Pinto, 2005; Rose, 2000; Schauer, 2009; Shimizu, 2009). The above mentioned factors have been popular in the field of pragmatic competence. Various aspects of pragmatic competence are strongly connected, but not only cognitively but also in the focus of sociocultural rehearse. There should be sufficient skills and pure knowledge of the target language so as to be able to communicate the intention properly and comprehend the message totally, especially when no explicit instruction is stated. This supports that thought; proficiency has a mandatory role on pragmatic development on a hand and its performance on the other hand. Nevertheless, the exposure to pragmatic instruction in the target language when related to the social interface and the practice of pragmatic production that implied by the social aspect of pragmatic competence is crucial to pragmatic development since the target community has likely got those chances, few recent studies have investigated the impact of living in the native language community as a significant factor leading to an effective pragmatic growth (Kinginger, 2008; Schauer, 2009).

2.2 Pragmatics

Kasper (1997; 2000) briefly described pragmatics as the examination of the ways a native or non-native speaker employs language in social encounters and its impacts on the other players in the communicative gathering. According to David Crystal, pragmatics is the study of how a speaker thinks of a language mainly in making their choice of the language use, the difficulties they face in the social communication and the impact the interlocution has on the individual participants in the communication process (Crystal, 1985). Following the previous description, he pointed out that pragmatics covers the factors causing our choice of words in social interaction and the impact of our language use on other users of the language. Thus, the investigation of the pragmatic use

and learning second language by non-native speakers can be called interlanguage pragmatics (Kasper, 1996). Inter-language pragmatics deals with the way pragmatic instruction leaves effects on the use and understate of the second language by learners. In addition, interlanguage pragmatics deals with the way pragmatic competence goes through progress in second language learning. Some people voiced their doubts over competence and stated that pragmatic ability is not teachable; moreover, some put forward the same argument with regard to form focused instruction, and argued that explicitly teaching pragmatics is not essential since learners' pragmatic production develops step by step through their constant contact with the second language. In brief, even advanced learners of L2 are not free of weakness with regard to L2 pragmatics; explicit teaching of pragmatics seems to be helpful to both EFL and ESL learners (Kasper, 1997; Kasper & Rose, 2001). Pragmatic competence covered numbers of skills in mastering and understating language in real context (Bialystok, 1993). These covered the skillfulness of second language learners to employ the second language for various ends like salutation, demanding, notifying, communicating and etc. the learners' competence to modify or change their speech in accordance with the expectations or requirements of the recipients or the circumstances, and the learners' competence to consider certain regulations; the conventions during giving a speech or communicating inside our own social environments, one may usually, easily and appropriately employed language to a number of deferent purposes. This is due to the fact that language is employed in usual expected manners. This mutuality emerged from the point that individuals of a social environment fraction act in accordance with the common standards of manner predictable by the other individuals of the fraction. On the other hand, outside our own social environment, we are occasionally hesitant whether the expressions we are employing is suitable and whether our understanding of communicational actions are precise, even if we have the exact first language with the outside elements. If individuals from an outside social cluster use unusual expression, despite using correct grammar and pronunciation, the inside social cluster would perceive that the communication of the social outsider is strange.

Another reason that played a part in the area of language use stemmed from the point that individuals of the same community have a common hand in specific non-linguistic

comprehension and practical knowledge. This practical knowledge regularly paves the way for interlocutors among members of the communities and enables them to comprehend each other's expressions without any other detail on the expressions. A well-known and common instance from textual discourse is that of the children's clothing store with a signboard on the window of store saying, " Baby Sale-This Week Only!', due to pragmatic skills, even without speaking to the store-owner, it is known that it is the clothing pieces which are for selling, not the babies. Another personal instance is of a student from Africa that has studied at the authors' *alma mater* in America around thirty years ago. When he landed in the airport he grabbed a bus from the airport to the intended college to study which located in the small southern town. By the time he dropped off the bus, he spotted across the road a store with a big signboard showing the terms, "WHITE STORE," and believed that the store was merely for white skin people. "White Store" was actually the name of a group of stores run by some people whose last name was "White". Obviously, it is not difficult to notice that pragmatic collapse more easily happens when there are considerable big gaps between the interlocutors' cultural background. It appeared that pragmatic competence is an integral part of cultural background. Moreover, the lack of cultural background actually might give rise to an unpleasant situation despite using correct linguistic forms. Yule (1996) remarked that this background difference existed in his own experience with language learning, saying that he has earned some grammatical rules and applied them in social interactions with no regard of learning pragmatic of those linguistic forms. During the initial author's developing pragmatic background of Cantonese language, he has faced difficulties in finding proper words to show polite refusals. In a number of communicative experiences, he felt doubts whether to use "mhsai" (not necessary), or "mhyiu" (don't need/want) or "mhoi" (don't like/love) to give his negative response. During the process of acquiring English, the second author also recalled facing identical difficulties in distinguishing the proper use of the expressions such as, "I'm sorry" and "Excuse me."

2.2.1 Communicative competence or pragmatic competence

Bachman (1990) stated that pragmatic competence is considered as an essential part of communicative competence, but there is an absence of an obvious, commonly established explanation of the phrase. According to Bachman's model, language competence was categorized into two fields comprising of 'pragmatic competence' and 'organizational competence'. Organizational competence referred to learning linguistic components and the regulations of linking them altogether for the purpose of sentence making; this implies that organizational competence covered discourse textual and grammatical competence. Pragmatic competence comprised of illocutionary competence; in other words, it referred to practical knowledge regarding sociolinguistic competence, speech functions and speech acts. Sociolinguistic competence involves the power to employ language accurately in compliance with context. Yet it covered the power to distinguish communicative actions and correct tactics to apply them based on the contextual relationship. According to Bachman's approach, pragmatic competence is not secondary to grammatical awareness and text construction, on the other hand, it was correlated to the textual and proper linguistic mastery and works together with 'organizational competence' in complicated manners.

A crucial issue regarding pragmatics is whether it is necessary to teach pragmatics to learners or not. It can be contended that pragmatic awareness basically grows along with grammatical and lexical awareness, without involvement of any instructional strategy. Nevertheless, research studies conducted on the grown-up second and foreign language learners' pragmatic competence have credibly suggested that there is significant difference between the pragmatics of native speakers and the pragmatics of L2 learners (Kasper, 1997).

Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper (1989) claimed that yet those learners with high proficiency level conducting communicative acts may unintentionally make pragmatic errors regardless of politeness consideration and illocutionary imposition. Thus, it is also necessary for L2 instructional strategy to center on the pragmatic aspect of the language. Furthermore, the leading studies in the field of pragmatics revealed that instructional methods targeted at increasing learners' pragmatic knowledge produced positive developments (Kasper, 1997). It is clearly noticed that teacher-based and instruction

assessments were interconnected and indivisible from each other due to their positive effects on learners' language progress. This is theoretically compatible with the idea of the role of assessment in the instructional method and socio-cultural framework of Vygotsky (Rea-Dickins, 2008; Fox, 2008).

2.2.2 The importance of pragmatic competence

Barron (2003) proposed a clear adequate definition of pragmatic competence; for Barron, pragmatic competence is an awareness of the linguistic means accessible in a certain language for comprehending particular speech or text, awareness of the chronological facets of speech acts and lastly awareness of the proper contextual employment of the specific languages' linguistic units. Two branches of pragmatic competence could be distinguished in the previous definition: the linguistic units of the L2 learner in the target language and the contextual employment of the linguistic units. The above definition sees pragmatic competence as consciousness: means being aware of accessible linguistic units and the awareness of the proper contextual employment of language. However, Thomas (1983) described pragmatic competence in relation to ability. He defines pragmatic competence as the ability of a speaker to employ language as the capacity of understanding a language properly in context and to achieve certain goals. He mentioned the two branches of pragmatic competence which cover, first, the linguistic aspect, and secondly the contextual or social facet, 'pragmalinguistics' and 'sociopragmatics' (Thomas, 1983). Richards, Platt, and Platt (1993); Hymes (1977) acknowledged that communicative competence is the power to make and comprehend sentences that are suitable and contextually relevant. For Hymes communicative competence covers four parts: first, Knowledge on the vocabulary and grammar of the language. Second, Knowledge on the norms of talking; awareness of how to start and finish a speech, awareness of which words should be employed with respective individuals etc. Third, Awareness of how to make and reply to respective speech acts, like, apologies, greetings, gratitude, praises, requests etc. Fourth, Awareness of the proper employment of language which refers to the language users' knowledge of the social and cultural issues, like the social position of the recipient that goes hand in hand with the circumstance *(*Hymes, 1977).

2.2.3 Progress in pragmatic competence

The difficulties faced in the process of instructing and learning pragmatic aspect of language appear to show a fundamental necessity for integrating pragmatics with teaching more methodically into teacher training courses. In place of plainly being informed of the best way to teach pragmatics, it is possible for instructors being well equipped with updating their knowledge and establishes for themselves effectual methods to create lessons and evaluation in their own teaching contexts for their specific learners. Similar teacher understandings, achieved through observation of real classroom settings, may change the present practical knowledge with regard to teaching pragmatics. A number of primary attempts were seen in some graduate classes and summer institutions in teaching pragmatics as provided in teacher training courses in the America and in Japan (e.g. Columbia Teachers College Tokyo, the University of Minnesota, University of Hawaii at Manoa and the University of South Florida). Scholars have also started examining evidences and outcomes of the teacher learning in the pre-mentioned programs (Eslami-Rasekh, 2005). On the other hand, the practicing instructors and graduate learners attending the programs occasionally pose concerns to which the area has up to now to fully take action. Initially, apart from the small number of language websites and textbooks particularly created for instructing pragmatics, a small space is provided for guidance for the development of pragmatics focused program of study. Since the knowledge of pragmatics is significantly reliant on the social contexts, learners are into contact with; there is no normal order of learning for interlanguage pragmatics which is akin to morphosyntax (Kasper and Schmidt, 1996). It is a real concern of active instructors to recognize what parts of pragmatics are more significant to instruct dissimilar learners and in what order they can efficiently be dealt with. Can pragmatics be effectively learnt as a separate class (speech acts based curriculum), or could it be more efficiently and methodically incorporated with language programs or other subjects fields (e.g., business and academic writing)? To what extents pragmatics should be taught with regard to other aspects of language, such as pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar?

Providing the preceding practical issues, curriculum improvement seems to be a production base for upcoming innovations. Similarly, pertaining to materials expansion,

since instructors are told to teach pragmatics founded on study-informed statistics, a great deal of the responsibilities can be taken by teachers themselves. In the existing condition, previous to designing their own teaching activities, teachers are advised to gather reliable teaching materials either from an available research study piece of writings or through their own information (that could be accomplished by collaboration with the learners), rather than distinguishing them in commercial textbooks or creating models through their own concerns. Meanwhile there are several web-based databases which can help instructors in their attempts (CARLA Speech Acts website <http://www.carla.umn.edu/speechacts/> and Discourse Pragmatics website <http://www.indiana.edu/~discprag/index.html>), more obviously taking place or in any case realistic teaching materials should turn into generally accessible, in case pragmatics is to become a typical ingredient of the L2 programs of study. Besides, taking advantage of instructors' and curriculum designers' shared knowledge, similar Collaborative efforts and collected resources are more expected to demonstrate better example of pragmatic categories (Schneider and Barron, 2008), deriving from a broader scope of language diversities and conversational partner reports, Prospective research studies on teaching pragmatics can be conducted to deal with pedagogical issues. For instance, via methodical meta-analysis (Jeon and Kaya 2006), the results of the performed experiments on interlanguage pragmatics can possibly be reconsidered as a means of wide-ranging required assessment, determining the fields of potential pragmatic failure of various accounts of L2 learners. More replicating studies may be performed to ease this effort. Additionally, age suitability for pragmatics learning may similarly be further dealt with. Although adult learners have been discovered to take advantage from explicit teaching of pragmatics, the similar method is improbable to work for young kids. In comparison to the existing conception of the way adult L2 learners have gained knowledge of pragmatics, there is limited information on the way kids build up L2 pragmatic competence (Achiba, 2003; Jones, 2007; Rose, 2000; 2009; Kanagy and Igarashi, 1997; Kanagy, 1999). It is necessary to study, for example, whether young learners are actually in need of instruction (Rose, 2005), and if so, deciding on what kind of teaching materials may be well-matched with the way they usually comprehend and what sides of pragmatics can be helpful to teach learners. The validity of studies

including a set of tests can be extended to examine the authenticity and dependability of in class evaluation with the aim of improving such assessing process. Lastly, studies conducted in real classroom environments are required as well as laboratory experiments to counter more systematically to the instructional issues of teachers and learners. In contrast to some of the studies just mentioned, Kim & Hall, (2002) found that the interactive reading program without an explicit and systematic input would bring about an opportunity to develop pragmatic competence in Korean Children.

2.3 The Impact of Language Proficiency on Pragmatic Competence

It is obvious that strong connection between pragmatic competence and communicative competence is stemmed from the impact of L2 proficiency. The impact proficiency placed on pragmatic competence to some degree originated from the existence of theoretical approaches of communicative competence over the last decades of 20th century (Canale & Swain, 1980; Bachman, 1990). Taguchi (2011) stated that there was prominent impact of proficiency in conducting a listening task of direct and non- direct implicatures if compared to the experience of studying abroad. The study confirmed that students with high proficiency have been able to respond more accurately, speedily, and efficiently in the test.

Hymes (1972) has focused on sociocultural use of language. According to him, these models arranged pragmatic and sociolinguistic capability as a particular crucial segment in L2 proficiency, from grammatical, discourse, and strategic capabilities. There is a differentiation between empirical efforts and pragmatic competence. Empirical efforts went behind the lead by considering whether pragmatic competence makes distinctive contributions to general proficiency. There are many studies that compared L2 learners' performances of a particular pragmatic feature cross wising over various proficiency levels dictated by institutionalized exams, grade level, or length of formal study (Taguchi, 2007; Xu and et al., 2009).

In the field of pragmatic use, such generalization has been driven from a wide range of studies that have particularly analyzed the production of speech act and compared them within various proficiency teams. Early studies contrasted speech acts and comparing L1

and L2 data transfer, and they recorded instances of L1 transfer which included positive or negative transfer in the utilization of techniques and the choice of lexicosyntactic (Maeshiba et al., 1996; Olshtain & Cohen, 1989). The component part of these studies have focused on the proficiency impact on transfer. The previous studies have investigated that L2 proficiency is emphatically associated with pragmatic transfer; they believed that high proficiency supports L1 transfer approach (Robinson, 1992; Takahashi & Dufon, 1989). Different studies have revealed a negative relationship among language proficiency and transfer (Takahashi & Beebe, 1987). Those learners with low proficiency level pursue more target-like norms than high proficient ones since they do not have adequate linguistic tools to transfer complex L1 pragmatic agreement in L2 employment. Su (2010) investigated Chinese EFL learners on the transference of the bi-directionality of both L1 and L2 with the focus of speech act of request. The data were also gathered through the WDCT. The researcher found that the participants conventionally applied an indirect system in making English request less than English L1 but used it more often that Chinese L1 when making requests in Chinese. These findings propose that the correlation between L1 transfer and proficiency is partially intervened by the target pragmatic elements. Supporting proof can be seen in Takahashi's study. Takahashi (1996) explored two dissimilar proficiency levels of Japanese EFL learner about the possibility of transfer of L1 request to L2 in a proper way. She realized that the observed transferability of certain L1 procedures was adversely impacted by low proficiency in certain learners. Apart from proficiency, learners' notable mistakes particularly form based function inserted in L1 and L2 mainly in both biclausal and complicated L2 request structures. They have not observed English non simple structure to function linguistically as equivalent as Japanese polite request production so it declined to transfer them. The most recent studies on speech acts went on investigating the impact of proficiency on speech acts. They confirmed that it was not always the case high proficiency functions native like in L2 pragmatic production. F´elix- Brasdefer (2007) confirmed the above thought in his study. He examined distinct proficiency levels, such as low, intermediate, and high. In his study, he examined one of the speech acts, how L2 speakers of Spanish produced polite requests at the variety levels of proficiency; moreover, free role-play was used in his study to collect the data in

numbers of situational scenarios including various formality levels. The result of the study declared that, more than 80% of the low proficiency employed direct requests, while the percentage was 36% in intermediate and 18% in high proficiency group. On the other hand, indirect strategies were also found in intermediate and advanced learners. High proficient learners applied lexical and syntactic mitigators; however, the occurrence and diversity of the mitigators failed to reach L1 speakers' models. In contrast, Dalmau and Gotor (2007) compared making apology as one of the speech act, which were created by 78 Catalan learners of English at three dissimilar proficiency levels. After responding a discourse completion test (DCT) which contained eight apologizing situational scenarios, and coding of those strategies which were used by participants. The impact of proficiency was recorded in the apologizing expressions, those with high proficiency follow the application of apology strategies as well as reducing the extended generalization of non- native like apologizing expressions for example the use of "excuse me" when making an apology). Lastly Grossi (2009) studied the use of complements and complementary responses by the English L2 speakers in speech act production and compared the differences of the complement use in their workplace and office work. The study considered the use of complement a very hard task.

Proficient learners have used a superior number of lexical intensifiers; however, the frequency failed to reach target like. High proficient learners faced difficulty in the morphosyntactic level, as recorded in the usage of erroneous structures (e.g., "I'm sorried"). There are several studies that dealt with this issue. For instance, Taguchi (2007) studied the impact of learners' proficiency when making correct employment of pragmatic practice. In his study, fifty nine Japanese L2 English learners at two different proficiency levels have participated. According to him, proficiency has a great impact on pragmatic competence, appropriate ratings and speech acts have which have great connection with one another. But the two varying levels of proficiency were different in duration of planning. Nevertheless, these discoveries indicated that linguistic competence does not adequately enough to support pragmatic competence mainly in the process of planning time (Garcia, 2004; Taguchi, 2008; Yamanaka, 2003).

Garcia (2004) investigated the correlation between high and low proficiency in comprehension competence. He examined them in indirect speech acts (participants' proficiency level was rated by TOEFL test). They were tested in listening with multiple choices given to the participants and the comprehension test assessed suggestions, requests, making offers. Garcia realized that proficiency has sufficient impact on comprehension but the distinction of high proficient speakers and native speakers is little to some extends. He also found that each kind of speech act has own effect on comprehension level.

According to the studies summarized above, there are varying findings about the effect of proficiency on pragmatic comprehension and production. Some studies showed that learners with high and intermediate proficiency scored better pragmatic functions, lead to strong comprehension abilities, and creation of relation between communicative competence and pragmatic competence, preventing from negative L1 transfer, develops much target like production and use of expressions, however some previous researches contrasted the above mentioned findings and even insisted on the effect of L1 transfer on the strategies that used in the directness of speech acts among advanced learners. They also stated that linguistic competence did not have anything to do with pragmatic competence.

2.3.1 Methods of developing pragmatic competence

Pragmatics as the knowledge of using the utterance to achieve various ends is an important part of the process of learning a foreign language. Teaching pragmatics, as a branch of applied linguistics, is considered as an essential part of language teaching and/or learning. Focusing on enhancing pragmatic competence of EFL learners, it is a challenging job of any language teacher (Chaudron, 1988). Mohammed (2012) realized the remarkable effect of instructional courses for developing pragmatic competence, particularly when given explicit instruction of speech acts of refusals and requests to the EFL learners.

Teachers should work very hard to contextualize the linguistic item they teach in order to increase the pragmatic competence of the learners. There are many factors involved in this process such as the teaching method or approach taken by the teachers when

teaching. Involving the learners in different activities to assist them to increase their pragmatic competence. Below shows some of the factors that involved in this process when it is teacher – centered methods:

- Teacher domination of discourse arrangements and managements (Ellis, 1990).
- Short – comings of making polite statements (Lörscher & Schulze, 1988)
- Speech acts' limited sphere (Long, Adams, McLean & Castaños, 1976)
- Simpler and obvious openings and closings (Lörscher, 1986; Kasper, 1989)
- Less availability of discourse markers (Kasper, 1989).

In the classroom discourse, the social relationship plays an essential role in teaching language. The unequal power between the teacher and the students creates a kind of sphere in the classroom which does not let the students express their ideas and information frankly. It obliges the teacher to push students to take part in the classroom activities. The chief weakest point in this imbalanced and unequal power between the teacher and the students is the centeredness of the teacher's role; in other words, the teacher must perform a central role in every activity. In a way, the students always wait for the teacher's instructions and ideas. They almost rely on the teacher, while they neglect their knowledge, ideas and information. The instruction transmission to the students is consistent with the classical methods of teaching; instructor is intentionally passing information for the students and he/she will follow up and monitors if the knowledge has been transferred to the students as a part of their knowledge (Nunan, 1989).

In contrast, in student-centered classroom discourses, the students feel more freedom to produce new ideas, express their ideas, knowledge much attractively. This is a real creative classroom atmosphere for learning, while they arrange and manage their classroom activities according to their needs and their motivated language learning activities. Pragmatics also has a great part in assessment of the student's competence. It is the most useful method to be used by the teachers. In classroom discourse, the teachers should assess the potential capacity of the students for learning the language. They have to look for the creative methods and activities to draw the student's attention

17

fully. More importantly, the teachers must be very careful about the classroom activities, more specifically, the topic that that they choose to talk and converse in classroom. The teachers have to create a balance between the student's awareness level and the topic. They must avoid themselves from selecting ambiguous topics and unclear subjects so as to help students to think well and express their ideas easily (Long et al., 1976). One of the useful resources that can be used in the classroom is classroom management; here language is not an object to be used for practice and analyses, but instead it can be applied as means of communication. If class management is conducted in L1 then the students may lose the experience of L2 use; However, Auerbach (1993) opposes this approach and believes that management should be done in the language of the majority' native language of the class, not the minority.

2.3.2 The impact of learning environment on l2 pragmatics

The argument so far focused on pragmatic learning. There have been growing needs to evaluate pragmatics formally and informally when it is taught in the classrooms systematically. Practitioners are by far not sure about ways of assessing pragmatic competence; however some authenticate tools have been created for this purpose; specifically what feedback they need to share it with the classroom students and how they should apply the assessment findings to develop pragmatic competence. Recently some preliminary efforts have been made regarding those notable challenges (Lee and McChesney 2000; Cohen, 2004); according to Ishihara and Cohen (2010), the examples of pragmatic assessing tools are WDCTs and with multiple rejoinder, multiple choices, role plays, self –assessments, where they are available instruments for class-based assessment. Additionally Ishihara (2009) investigated the value of teacher assessment of classroom based pragmatic teaching through the application of role plays, self-assessment and self - reflection of the students who were part of the controlled group via few rubrics for assessing the learners' competence in class despite the lack of resources in the field of raising pragmatic competence. He achieved various degrees of pragmatic growth when assessed the participants through well-organized assessing instruments in a classroom-based pragmatic learning. The study grounded in two

important themes; the socioculture theory of Vigotsky and the approach of teacher based assessment.

Davison and Leung (2009), O'Malley and Valdez Pierce (1996), Poehner (2007; 2009) stated the possibility of applying the instructional pragmatic over not only the small number of learners but also over the learners of the entire classroom. As discussed so far, literature witnessed many studies and investigations that have been conducted about instructional pragmatic but yet further efforts should be made; this study concentrates on classroom-based course of work that conducted for senior university students aiming at studying the impact of foreign language classroom on pragmatic development.

2.4 Teaching Pragmatic Competence

A lot of researchers have the same viewpoint that pragmatic competence is not only grasped through exposure. The most problematic challenge for instructors is the way how teaching culture necessarily are dealt with; it is sounded as extra skills melted in L2 learning by considering cultural context as principals (Kramsch, 1993). Another study affirmed that equipping the learner to state his/her views in a way he/she intends to do so whether diplomatically or impolitely is the teachers' task. The thing we intend to prevent is his/her accidental rudeness or obedience. To put it differently, she believes that learners should be provided with needed information to decide how to employ the target language (Thomas, 1983).

Takimoto studied how the deductive and inductive instruction is effective in developing pragmatic competence of EFL learners. The study's main objective was to teach learners to apply lexical and grammatical downgraders in English language so as to conduct non-obvious requests. He also found that inductive teaching is prominent mainly when inter-related with problem solving tasks (Takimoto, 2008).

Bardovi-Harlig (1996) concerned about using textbooks in classrooms too much, as they signified only speech acts idealistically. She proposes a range of approaches to raise awareness of pragmatics. Instructors are able to urge students to consider in which way a certain speech act varies in their own language. This might result in classroom-led deliberations and, for more developed students, gathering facts outside the classroom.

Studies paying attention to pragmatic competence of students when teaching C and CR(complements and complement responses) as in Holmes and Brown (1987), who advanced a variety of tasks to make the acquirement of both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic competence easily. The purpose of the tasks were to identify and create Cs as well as CRs. One of the tasks included students who accumulated samples of naturally occurring facts so as to increase attentiveness of the contextual significance as well as topics where they arise. Learners were heartened to gather both spoken as well as written examples, and naturally coming data or from television as well as film data. Barraja-Rohan (2003) talks about samples of Australian English Cs and CRs usually engaging self-deprecation. A task in the classroom is illustrated where learners discuss the aptness of the Cs given after that they inquire the discussions by having functions.

2.4.1 The necessity for teaching pragmatic competence

When foreign language students were monitored by a lot of educational and linguistic experts, they highlighted that instruction in pragmatics is undoubtedly needed. Numbers of differences from native speakers are significantly exposed by foreign language students in the area of language usage, in implementing and understanding definite speech acts, in spoken roles for example how to say hello and good-bye, in rejecting an offer, refusing an invitation, and in conversational running for instance back channeling and short replies (see Bardovi-Harlig, 1996; Kasper & Schmidt, 1996; Kasper & Rose, 2001). Without teaching, dissimilarities in pragmatics appear in foreign learners' English apart from their language proficiency. In other words, a student whose linguistic or grammatical proficiency is high does not possibly express equivalent pragmatic progress.

The outcomes of pragmatic differences, unlike grammatical mistakes, are frequently construed on a social or individual level rather than a consequence of the language acquisition procedure. As a result, making a kind of pragmatic mistake might hold diverse upshots: it probably hampers high-quality communication between learners, making the speaker show as rapid or brusque in social interaction, bad-mannered or indifferent. Kasper (1997) regarded the state of inaptness between linguistic aptitude and pragmatic presentation as proof that training in pragmatics is essential. Consequently,

without some sort of teaching, a lot of facets of pragmatic competence do not progress automatically or adequately. Leech (1983) claimed that the factors behind pragmatic failure can be attributed to:

1. Students' lack of knowledge of the pragmatic regulations of the foreign language they are learning.

2. The movement of the students' community norms to the society of the target language they are learning.

2.4.2 The purpose of teaching pragmatic competence

The aim of teaching pragmatics lies in students' pragmatic awareness, providing them with options for their communications in the target language and familiarizing them with the variety of pragmatic practices as well as tools in the second language. These sorts of teaching assist students preserve their own societal identification and take part much perfectly in the target language interacting with much power over both intended force and result of their participations (Giles, Coupland, and Coupland, 1991). For that reason, researchers in the study area of interlanguage pragmatics have placed their emphasis on the necessity of assimilating pragmatic mainly in both L2 and foreign language teaching (Rose and Kasper, 2001; Bardovi-Harlig and Mahan-Taylor, 2003; Martinez-Flor et al., 2003; Tatsuki, 2005). Despite the fact that a lot of linguistic experts disagree with this thought that competence can be taught; others still discuss the likelihood of advancing some of its sides. According to Kasper (1997), although instructors fail to teach competence, learners have to be given chances to widen their pragmatic competence: Competence is a kind of knowledge which students own, expand, obtain, use or misplace. The most difficult task in foreign or second language teaching is the establishment of learning environment in a way that they can take advantage of pragmatic competence progress in L2 as a lot of studies based on pragmatic teaching have been accomplished from the beginning of eighties and onwards.

2.5 Assessing Pragmatic Competence in Classrooms

Decades ago, Oller (1979) stood first to bring in the notion of pragmatic tests through setting restraints for their administration (Liu, 2006a).

Therefore, pragmatic experiments were at first described as assignments, which needed the meaningful processing of language items' order in the examined language at real-life speed (Oller, 1979). It is notable that texts are estimated to be approached as linguistic units carrying meaning.

Additionally, there was the belief that pragmatic experiments should be similar to the use in the real world as much as possible (Liu, 2006a). Language testing is an area which has received scholars' concentration (Hughes, 1989; McNamara, 1996; 2000) whereas the evaluation of pragmatic competence has not given rise to many investigations yet (Kasper and Rose 2001; Rover, 2005). The hardship in setting tests for evaluating students' pragmatic proficiency is a key factor for those who develop tests and made them not to be fond of making this attempt (Liu, 2006a; Kasper and Rose, 2001). Liu (2006a; 2006b; 2007) mentioned that tests principally set to evaluate definite sides of pragmatic competence openly.

Consequently, we claim that pragmatic tests are helpful for in the study of pragmatic competence and its development although, pragmatic competence is a related side of communicative competence (Liu, 2007). One could argue that if pragmatic competence is investigated, communicative competence is always examined as well. In communication, students employ instruction of both language form and language usage. Therefore, pragmatic competence is often indirectly evaluated and sometimes directly assessed relatively in the areas of pragmatic communication and performance testing. Kratiko Pistopiitiko Glossomathias (KPG) had own purposes in evaluating overall performance. He used task specific rating tasks in the section of the written-based test, examined in his study, intended in the first assessment to assess applicants' pragmatic aptitude. Thus, KPG, who examined the practice of C1 level Module 2, formed a sort of pragmatic tests (Karatza, 2009).

So far we have focused on the discussion of pragmatics instruction. When pragmatics is informed as a system in classroom, assessing competence of pragmatics brings up. Having some legal tools which are created mainly for research, it isn't so easy for

trainers to decide in what way to assess the learners, which feedback has to be given, and in which way they are able to use assessment for the following instruction to pave the way for further pragmatic progress. Recently, some efforts have been offered regarding these applicable considerations (Lee and McChesney, 2000; Cohen, 2004; Ishihara and Cohen, 2010) where making applicable instruments have been introduced as suitable means of assessments in classroom setting such as oral role-play, written DCTs with multiple rejoinder, cloze exercise, self-evaluation- multiple choice and discourse rating tests are the examples of assessing tools that can be applied in pragmatic competence).

Furthermore, Ishihara (2009) examined learner's variable numbers of pragmatic progress which were assessed by cooperatively advanced classroom-based tools. The learner's assessment embraces titles for the purpose of assessing learners in the fields of consciousness, invention, meta-pragmatic consciousness (reusing pragmatic norms that lately acquired) and the assessments of the learners due to their language use and community interpretation. Dynamic progress, though still not applied, was first appeared in Vygotskisn's sociocultural theory and the teacher-based assessment approaches. O'Malley and Valdez Pierce (1996); Davison and Leung (2009) appeared to be promising for utilization in assessing pragmatic learning for the whole students in the class (Poehner, 2009), not just for a few student participants (Poehner, 2007). If an experiential study is just started, there will be too much to find out in this issue. It is worth mentioning, literature in educational pragmatics has widened too much that can cover pedagogical considerations.

2.5.1 Ambiguities and issues of assessing pragmatics

According to Schneider & Barron (2008), during the process of teaching and assessing pragmatics, several difficulties arise within the changeability of pragmatics in various sociocultural practices because of the macrosocial differentiation (e.g., gender, regional, social, , ethnic, and generalization of dissimilarities in pragmatic standards), a suitable or proposed scope of patterns of linguistic manner demonstrates unlikely due to the speakers' own characteristics and social history (McNamara & Rover, 2006). Lenchuk and Ahmed (2013) realized the social variables influence the native speakers' linguistic

choice such as (gender, age, social and culture background). They also confirmed the significance of explicit knowledge in fostering pragmatic competence in one way or another. Thus, the use of the pragmatic language is delicate to different circumstantial causes which then pave the way to macrosocial variation (Schneider & Barron, 2008), variation relies on, (e.g., the interlocutors' relevant social situation , psychological/social remoteness, and level of imposition). Furthermore, for L2 pragmatics researchers came up with another challenge. Multicultural individuality makes L2 speakers deliberately refuse what they consider as the standards of native speakers regardless of consciousness and linguistic demands of these standards (Ishihara, 2006; LoCastro, 2003; Siegal, 1996). The practical selections of learners, whether lodging or a rejection considering community standards, are made from their discussion of individuality and practicing activity so consideration should be given in teaching and instruction not to push native speakers' standards on L2 (e.g., Kasper & Rose, 2001; Canagarajah, 1999). In addition, learners must not be punished in assessment because of their intentional non-target like functions. If so, it could be taken as linguistic obligation or cultural imperialism (Thomas, 1983). Indeed, pragmatically teacher-based assessment can be used for certain tactics to evaluate learners' receptive consciousness and inventive skill. In assessing learners' pragmatic understanding, teachers have to depend on the scope of L2 society customs for the purpose of understanding community members' words regarding social communication. Here, learners' practical use of language by teachers should not be evaluated through learners approaching and imitating to the native speaker standards but through learners' intended meanings and the subtle distinctions of why they choose to say, whether they meet together or depart from society standards. Moreover, language skills (and here, pragmatic proficiency) depend on context (McNamara & Rover, 2006), social contract properly can assess learners' pragmatic language use, considering how they convey their message, identity, cultural connection in the certain context.

2.5.2 Methods of teacher assessment of l2 pragmatic competence

Teacher-based assessment techniques seem to be applicable for L2 pragmatics despite the complexities mentioned above since teachers are considered to be able to evaluate the learners' pragmatic use in crossing their intended meaning in the social framework.

Assessment is quite critical to students' communicative aims. Generally speaking, successful communication should be examined regarding the method at which learners want to lose their identity via the second language production. Learners' pragmatic awareness may be rated by making use of their pragmatic perception and the metapragmatic interpretation of the social context. Instructors are able to comprehend leaner's pragmatic assumption and awareness in mutual dialogue and putting together daily information and evaluation on rolling basis. In teacher-based assessment, this type of assessment is mostly depended on learner's production of language; it can either be written or spoken language when conducting an authentic or simulated assignments. This is going to be via an evaluation form since learners employ their former input and appropriate knowledge, mostly in interacting discourse (Brown, 2004).

Due to the difficulties mentioned above, L2 pragmatics teacher-based assessment processes are subtly appropriate since teachers eventually require assessing how learners' language use is possibly reaching their intended meaning in the community framework, evaluation seems to be essentially delicate to students communicative objectives. The average grade of the learners' production in the field of speaking should be examined by the way of learner's intention to discuss their individuality through the use of L2. Teacher needs in terms of resources and teacher training in developing pragmatic competence are the essential part of pragmatic competence in the classroom as instructors are the prime agent of instructing pragmatic competence in one way and assessing the participants' competence on the other way when pragmatic is used in context (Ishihara, 2010).

Grading of learner's pragmatic awareness can just be assessed through dealing with their pragmatic understanding and metapragmatic examinations of the community context. In such an assessment, teachers are able to extract learners' intent and pragmatic awareness through a cooperated negotiation and continuously assimilate it to a day-by-day teaching assessment. Teacher-based assessment is mainly applied depending on what speakers produce; written or spoken language, when the learners take real or fake tests. In this sort of evaluation, learners depend on their first instruction and associated skills, mostly in reactive dialogues (Brown, 2004; O'Malley & Valdez-Pierce, 1996). The features of teacher-based classroom assessment embrace (regardless to) the application of various

and complementary tools, an magnificent effort by students, the use of great factual tasks, the practice of higher-order thinking, focusing on the procedure including product, joining different language figures, in progress of demonstrations for assessing principles to the learners, getting advantage from feedback as method for helping teaching (Brown, 2004; Fox, 2008; O'Malley & Valdez-Pierce, 1996; Tedick, 2002). Since the aim of teacher-based assessment is made up to the students to learn better in order to enrich the overall students' skills not only a few chosen ones (Lynch, 2001; Shohamy, 2001), learners' skills are normally mentioned or refined in an instructive account, which covers the students' written tasks and what they can perform. Hence, the assessment gives analytic instruction considering learners' recent knowledge and developments, helping teachers to decide for the following course of instruction. Dependability and validity of classroom-based assessment have been argued between their proponents (Lynch, 2001; Lynch & Shaw, 2005; McNamara & Rover, 2006). A real grade of validity seems to be simulated grounded in the straight assessment and actual descriptions of the test (e.g., Huerta-Macias, 1995). Numbers of studies have stated that validity ought not to be admitted easily and even there might be concerns in creating validity (Brown & Hudson, 1998). The dependability of teacher-based assessment mainly owned a different concept than traditional systematized tests (Lynch & Shaw, 2005). Rater disagreements probably can come up from dissimilarities in raters' individuality; in this situation; the potential difference in rater response might normally be resulted from the variability of pragmatics. Likewise, dependability is not taken for granted since a class teacher who might not be well-trained to rate is the only assessor of the learners tasks in a limited time manner. Furthermore, teacher-based assessment can be considered as somehow unpractical, as tools might not be easy to construct and even wasting more time than old fashioned standard tests (Fox, 2008). It is significant that teacher assessments should not be overestimated. Admitting the challenges and ambiguities discussed thus far in this thesis, about pragmatic assessment will lead to further discussions about these initial efforts concerning the role of teacher classrooms in enhancing pragmatic competence.

2.5.3 Approaches on teacher-based assessment of pragmatics competence

Teaching and teacher-based assessment are undoubtedly parts of a successive process and cannot be separated from one another considering the assistance of learners' language growth which theoretically interrelate to the concept of assessment in the teaching process that of Vygotsky's sociocultural theory (Fox, 2008; Rea-Dickins, 2008), specifically the notion of the zone of proximal development (ZPD), an idea which affirmed that cognitive progress drives from the language-mediated tasks interacting with others who has well-developed cognitive capacity for example (instructor or an advanced classmate) (Vygotsky, 1978). It is relatively connected to the notion of ZPD that is instructor's or classmate's scaffolding which is usually intermediated by language or cultural artifacts and composed of a certain guidance or unpremeditated feedback that provided to learners grounded in their reflection of proficiency (e.g., Lantolf, 2000; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Ohta, 2005; Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976). In teacher-based instruction and L2 pragmatics assessment, encouragement can be linked in the process of instruction, where instructors guide students to the main properties of discourse making and direct them to select the suitable language methodology.

On the other hand, instructors might mention language features which are not absolutely suitable in learners' production to lead self-reflection and development. Teachers' scaffolding is made through dialogues to assist comprehension and enhance cognitive development. It might be individualized, accounting every single learner's activity or aimed for a group or smaller than a group of students in a classroom. Scaffolding might be achieved through more talented peers as well. Within an effective mediation, learners are ultimately able to take the latest achieved instruction or skills and turn them into a self-regulation since it is not necessary to be a part of their cognitive repertoire (Vygotsky, 1978).

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This study has investigated the role of classroom instruction in raising pragmatic competence. This section covers the methodology of the study and efficient methods of conducting the tests and identifying the findings. Following that, the research design is subtly stated, including the details of the participants, procedures, and other technical segments of the study. Lastly, the data collection method and the instruments are explained in detail to envisage the frame of the study as well as the analysis of the study's findings and the discussion of those findings.

The study has got the following research questions to seek for their sufficient answers;

1. Can classroom-based explicit instruction develop pragmatic competence?
2. Is there a relationship between L2 proficiency level and pragmatic competence?
3. Is gender a factor affecting the L2 pragmatic competence?

3.2 Participants

This study is about "Raising Pragmatic Competence in Foreign Language Classrooms". It deals with the possibility of developing pragmatic competence in classrooms particularly among L1 Kurdish speakers with high proficiency in their L2 English. The study focused on senior university students who are English L2 speakers. The role of proficiency, class-based course and gender factor were also assessed in acquiring pragmatic competence through a written-based test. The participants of this study have been nominated at the University of Sulaimanyah (one of the Northern Iraq state universities) as fourth year English language students. Participants have voluntarily participated in the experiment.

The participants attended pragmatics sessions twice a week for 90 minutes, for the total of two months. There were 50 adult students with the mean age of 23.02 (25 females; 25 males) in two experimental groups. The students were randomly assigned out of 120 students based on their English proficiency which was indicated by their GPA or its equivalence based on the previous three years exam results. Those who have got % 75 and above were considered as high proficient students. The participants have already taken courses on English Syntax, Linguistics, Semantics, Phonetics, Phonology, English conversation, Text Analysis, Essay writing and English Literature as parts of their academic courses. GPAs in English courses was also used in (Shmais, 2003), that can authenticate students' proficiency.

Table 3.1: Age , Gender Distribution and the duration of Learning English

	Age Distribution			Gender		Duration of Learning English		
	Below 21	21-23 years	23 and Above	Male	Female	Less than 4 years	4-8 years	8 years and More
Frequency	1	25	24	25	25	4	41	5
Percentage %	2.0	50.0	48.0	50.0	50.0	8.0	82.0	10.0
Mean ± S.D		23.02 ± 3.2					4.88 ± 2.37	

It is noticed in Table 3.1 that 50.0% of the participants were between the age of 21 to 23; 48.0% were at the age of 23 and above and also merely 2.0% of the participants were less than 21 years old; Moreover, the mean and standard deviation of age were (23.02, 3.2) respectively.

The above table shows that 50.0% of the total participants were males; and also the other 50.0% of them were females. This clearly signifies equal number of genders participated in the tests and gender balance was considered in identifying the students.

It also illustrates the length of learning English of the participants: 82.0% have been learning English for 4 to 8 years; 10.0% have been learning English for 8 years or more and also 8.0% of the total participants have been learning English for less than 4 years. The results of the English study indicates that, the majority of the students have experienced learning English for 4 – 8 years as seen in the above table; the mean and standard deviation of the learning period is (4.88, 2.37) respectively. This achieved result confirms the English background of those students who were selected to attend the intensive pragmatic course. Additionally the duration of learning a language is contributing in building up proficiency as in (Khalil, 2005). He considered the duration of study as one of the means of raising proficiency.

3.3 Instruments

Students' assessments and tests are essential to the process of learning and denote the improvements the learners have reached in a certain timeframe. The assessment of learners' language ability can lead to the attainments of various methods for collecting information (Coombe et al., 2007). Written Discourse Completion Task (WDCT) has been widely used in pragmatic related studies. Researchers acknowledged that WDCT has high validity in assessing pragmatic competence particularly in EFL classrooms and considered it the most accurate assessing tools (Hudson and et al., 1995). Aufa (2013) has recently examined the WDCT as an assessing tool, and found that it is still the most effective tool to assess pragmatic competence; moreover, it positively decreases the test limitations. The test (see the Appendix A) focused on the written competence of classroom students; this comprises of 15 different items in four independent parts; the first part of the test assesses participants' inference capacity in which three statements are presented and students should infer what is meant by them. The second part of the test intends to evaluate the students for their competence of implicature through three declarative statements. The students need to guess the speakers' meaning when reading those statements. Part three of the test consists of five items testing students' comprehension given multiple choices to decide whether the items are grammatical, meaningful, or appropriate with justifying their responses, where the students should concentrate on structural meaning and interpretation. Four situational scenarios envisage

the last part of the test, exploring the readers' proper responses of speech acts' most useable categories such as polite requests, apologies, refusals, and offer and various ways that the test takers may apply in responding them and their accuracy in distinguishing between polite, impolite, formal or informal answers.

3.4 Instructional Materials and Procedure

In the process of L2 learning, diverse materials have been used based on the linguistic topics and its purposes. In the current study, a specific book was used to instruct pragmatics in classrooms. The main resource of the course is "*Introduction to Pragmatics*" by Betty J. Birner which was published in 2013. The book comprises of 10 chapters with discussion and exercise sections that supported the elaboration of developing pragmatic competence. The students were supposed to study pragmatic as one of the compulsory courses before they have graduated. They have intensively learnt a lot of pragmatic related significant subjects, namely the definition of pragmatics and meaning (literal via non-literal), implicature and the types of implicature, Grice's maxims (Quality, Quantity, Relation and Manner), reference and deixis, presupposition, entailment and defeasibility, speech acts (request, offer, refusals, acceptance, apologies), inference and discourse (See the research design for the details of the sessions). These topics would constantly teach variety of communication types that facilitate the development, production and recognition of pragmatics in context. Generally speaking, they are commonly practiced in many illocutionary acts so recognizing those linguistic terms in context will indisputably enhance learners' competence. Additionally, the subjects were given and explained by an assistant professor with the facilitation of the researcher to the students in detail. The session was run for 90 minutes once a week for successively 8 weeks. The sessions were divided over four stages; first, the instructor began the session with warm-ups which included the review of the topics had been taken in the previous lesson for 15 minutes. Elicitation was the second stage of the lesson, in which the students were presented with examples, short written paragraphs, statements, and discussion questions about the main topic before the topic was actually defined or explained. That let the students had a chance to brainstorm and share their answers of the questions raised, this stage was lasting for 25 minutes. Following that, presentation

stage was conducted, the instructor defined the main topic of the day and illustrated the topic with PowerPoint presentation that comprised handful of examples and role- plays, this part was going on for almost 35 minutes. Finally, the remained time was devoted to wrap ups, giving feedbacks and discussion making about the given input. As a researcher, I assisted the instructor in managing the class, observing the students' pragmatic production and development in the class, selection of the topics in the test book, preparing PowerPoint presentation, and often conducting the whole session in her absence. The course was followed by the post-test which was developed by the researcher of the current study.

In this case study, Written Discourse Completion Tasks (WDCT) has been administrated to evaluate the development and the level of pragmatic competence. The participants have undergone the pre-test and the post-post which intentionally covered the few widely used topics in pragmatics such as speech acts, inference and implicature and structural meaning and interpretation. The study was conducted in the academic year (2015 – 2016) at the University of Sulaimanyah, in Northern Iraq.

The participants were aimlessly divided into two semi-equal groups with 23 and 27 students in order to have a standard class size and provide immeasurable learning chances to the participants. All were high proficient students and had to take the pre-test before they studied pragmatics in the classroom setting in April 2016. The students had 60 minutes to respond the pre-test and the same time was devoted to the post-test. The test was a written-based test with no multiple choices which aimed at evaluating participants' written capacity of pragmatic competence. The purpose of the pre-test was to exhibit the participants' prior knowledge of pragmatic use in sociocultural context. Following the pre-test, the participants have intensively attended the two months class-based sessions about pragmatics and pragmatics production. After two months of giving explicit instruction about pragmatic, feedback to students' output and class discussions; the learners' development of pragmatic competence was assessed by the post-test which was totally the same as the pre-test in the mid of June 2016. It intended to demonstrate the difference that participants made and the progress they have achieved during course period. The researcher has also noted the participants' active participation in the class

regarding the development of pragmatic production which can simply be phrased as verbal competence. The tests' main focus were the students' written production skills. The answer sheets were accurately graded by researcher on four scale grading based on directness, formality and politeness of the responses made to the test items. To ensure the reliability in grading, the singed sheets were reviewed and double checked by the instructor. The obtained data has entered into the SPSS program (Statistical Package for Social Scientists) version 20; in order to achieve inter- rater reliability and accurate results. The test result was grouped in accordance with the participants' English proficiency and gender difference, the impact of pragmatic-related courses (explicit instruction) on L2 learners of Northern Iraq university students since they are the main concerning questions of the study.

3.5 Research Design

This part of the methodology is designed to highlight every week's pragmatic-focused subjects, tasks and activities conducted to meet the goals of the course that set by the instructor to develop pragmatic competence in the classroom setting. Remarkably the overall class activities have served verbal competence as students and the instructor have communicated verbally during the class teaching.

Week 1

Subjects: Definition of pragmatics and meaning (literal via non-literal)

Objectives: the students will be able to learn the definition of pragmatics and can interpret sentence and word meaning better.

Materials: Introduction to Pragmatics by Betty J. Birner, published 2013. Page 1 - 25

Allocated time: 90 min.

Activity: the topics were explained via handful of examples which has semantic meaning and pragmatic meaning, they were excerpted from page 24 and 32 (See the Appendix D). The students were asked first to read the sentences and state what is the direct and the indirect meaning of those given examples.

Reflection: The students seemed to be freshmen and curios in pragmatics and have not had enough backgrounds about the topic so they could not interact in the class at the beginning but later they initiated to share their input during interpreting the examples. Some of their interpretations were relevant and some others' were not. Eventually, the participants learnt how to interpret and consider the hidden meaning of written statements. The overall reflection was, those with high linguistic competence would acquire or affect the level of pragmatic competence more.

Week 2

Subjects: Implicature and the types of implicature

Objectives: The session will increase the participants' interpretational capacity of speaker meaning mainly when a speaker states something or a writer presents a piece of writing.

Materials: Introduction to Pragmatics by Betty J. Birner, published 2013. Page 40- 41 and 62 – 72.

Allocated time: 90 min.

Activity: The instructor employed sufficient examples and short written paragraphs excerpted from page 41 and 70, (See the Appendix D). The printed copies of the tasks were distributed over the students to discuss among themselves but the reader need to be aware of macrosocial variables of the speaker as well as cultural norms in order to conduct the best interpretation.

Reflection: when the second week's session began, the students were speechless and gazed at the instructor as if they were waiting to hear the new pragmatic topic. For them, implicature was incredibly new, not only as a class topic but also as a term since most of the participants have not even heard about it. The activities urged the students to express their thoughts and impressions plainly on the topic; the students soon started to discuss the examples and short paragraphs together and caused higher participations in the class.

Week 3

Subjects: Grice's maxims (Quality, Quantity, Relation and Manner)

Objectives: The participants will be more aware of the types of the instruction and what is missing as provided by the speaker or writer in a spoken or written context.

Materials: Introduction to Pragmatics by Betty J. Birner, published 2013. Page 42-61
Allocated time: 90 min.

Activity: The students have got written tasks, they need to read texts and should highlight what maxim is applied and what maxim is violated by the writer then they discussed this together in pairs and exchange ideas among themselves. The tasks were excerpted from page 47 and 61. (See the Appendix D)

Reflection: The participants seemed not as freshmen as before since they have attended few pragmatic sessions thus far. They still need more to learn particularly about the speaker meaning since pragmatic was based on this aspect on a hand. I noted that the participants looked happy when they feel their background knowledge was increased. When they read the text in the class, they discussed the task in pairs then shared it with peers in the class. By the end of the session, the students confirmed that they have got more experiences in identifying the speaker meaning, and the quality and quantity of information should be provided for listeners or readers.

Week 4

Subjects: Reference and deixis

Objectives: The participants are able to identify the signs and pointing that encounter in pragmatic production and what reference those signs refer to.

Materials: Introduction to Pragmatics by Betty J. Birner, published 2013. Page 110-131
Allocated time: 90 min.

Activity: There were a lot comparing statements including references and linguistic expressions to point something, and discussion questions about the written statements. The examples and tasks were excerpted from page 112, 144 and 145 (See the Appendix D).The students were divided into groups of five, and discussed the tasks together which

were singling out the sings that used in the statements and their references then the groups' speakers shared the final answers of the groups. Later the instructor gave them feedbacks and commented on their outputs.

Reflection: When the session started, the subjects interacted to the activities as they have got discussion questions and comparing similar statements. The reference and deixis were not hard for them to identify and seemed to be as easy as cake to the participants since they have years of experience in English learning. However, students with lower proficiency level faced a bit difficulty in their verbal performance.

Week 5

Subjects: Presupposition, entailment and defeasibility

Objectives: The course attendants will be able to recognize what the speaker assume to be the case prior to produce the utterance and what the sentence entails than the speaker.

Materials: Introduction to Pragmatics by Betty J. Birner, published 2013. Page 146-160
Allocated time: 90 min.

Activity: The instructor employed several exercises to transfer the message to the participants such as singling out the presuppositions and entailments in comprehension texts, given statements. The exercises and texts were excerpted from page 166, 173 and 174. (See the Appendix D)

Reflection: The students were not initially familiar with the topic since presupposition is a new topic for them. The instructor tried hard to engage the participants as much possible in order to raise their pragmatic competence. As a researcher, noted that the positive developments were seen among the students, comparing to the startup of the course but there were still students needed extra care and support to develop their competence especially those with the lower proficiency than the rest of the participants. The oral interaction of the students with the class instructor have created a medium to raise program development since the class activities explicitly motivated the students to achieve this.

Week 6

Subjects: Speech Acts

Objectives: The students will understand the utterances in a way that what action should be taken when they hear the speaker.

Materials: Introduction to Pragmatics by Betty J. Birner, published 2013. Page 175-200
Allocated time: 90 min.

Activity: Role-plays and situational scenarios were applied to get the students comprehend what task the speakers want to perform by uttering a specific statement. couple of students role played together. When they got a prompt, the first students initiated to state according to the given prompt, and the second students replied immediately per his/her knowledge. This has been repeated several times in order that they would learn from each other. The activities were taken from page 179, 182 and 205 (See the Appendix D).

Reflection: The educational examples and scenarios got the students interacted in the classroom and they were even excited with their development when they took part in the class activities. By then their pragmatic competence have been increased since they could get the topic easier; moreover, they were more confident in expressing their opinions, comments and responses. The participants seemed to have learned more about pragmalinguistics, namely the politeness, formality and directness when making their utterances. Some other students have demonstrated awareness about the social norms in their pragmatic productions. Finally, it has been noted that some students regarded macrosocial variability of pragmatic use.

Week 7

Subjects: Inference

Objectives: The In-class learners will capture a strategy of interpreting statements and inferring the meaning from the learners' point of view.

Materials: Introduction to Pragmatics by Betty J. Birner, published 2013. Page 241-260
Allocated time: 90 min.

Activity: Exercises and discussion questions were used to go deep in the topic. The instructor engaged as many students as possible in the exercises and discussion so to develop their inferential capacities. The activities were excerpted from page 244 and 255 (See the Appendix D).

Reflection: The subjects were soon got the idea of listener's inferring of meaning right after the practice side of the lesson when the instructor gave few examples of inference making. The activities motivated the course participants to interact in the class and the instructor gave them feedbacks of their participations and conventions.

Week 8

Subjects: Discourse

Objectives: The attendees of the course will gain knowledge about the use of language in social context that can either be spoken or written and will possibly learn to study languages beyond the sentences.

Materials: Introduction to Pragmatics by Betty J. Birner, published 2013. Page 271-290 Suggested time: 90 min.

Activity: Sample examples and complex sentences were manifested discourse analyses and discourse representation theory. They were excerpted from page 280 and 291. (See the Appendix D)

Reflection: The topic sounded not an easy task to the participants as it was noted that they considered it the interpretation of sentences, they brainstormed a lot and gave dozens of analyses during the session. The students worked as groups to realize what is meant by discourse analyses. The participants were enthusiastic in the discussions and each group wanted to share their notes sooner that the others.

3.6 Analysis

In this case study, the quantitative data collected from the sit-down tests and WDCT then they were calculated and analyzed by running t-tests and ANOVA procedure. The test results were analyzed by a professional statistician via the application of SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Scientists) program version 20. After computing the obtained data, they were analyzed by using the computer program to present the mean scores and standard deviation of each parts of the test. The statistical analysis composed of statistical description, t-tests, ANOVA to inspect the the level of pragmatic development in the pre-test and the post-test. ANOVA was used to test the first research question and two t-tests were applied to scrutinize the second and the third research questions. ANOVA was also run to examine relation between the length of L2 and raising pragmatic competence. Four basic comparisons were conducted about the main parts of the test reflecting both the pre-test and the post-test; first was about inference, the second comparison was about implicature, the third one was about structural errors and interpretation and the last one was about speech acts. The purpose of the comparisons was to present the level of improvement the students have reached after receiving explicit instruction in the class for almost two months.

Consequently the analyses highlight the current pragmatic knowledge of the participants during the pre-test and their immediate responses of what they read. The post-test would determine the participants' development of pragmatics when undergoing two months of learning pragmatic in EFL classroom at few levels. The impact of English proficiency on developing pragmatics, the prominent differences the gender factor make in acquiring competence, the influence of the duration of L2 experience and the energy that the class-based instruction lends the students in raising their pragmatic competence.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Results

This chapter encompasses the results of the study and the discussions of the findings with regards to the research questions. This begins with data tables to demonstrate the study results, and is followed by the narrative analysis of the findings that were achieved in the pre-test and post-test. The current study concentrates primarily on scrutinizing the strength of classroom-based curricula to raise pragmatic competence.

The sample was composed of 50 students from senior university students who have studied and taken tests in pragmatics for the first time. The results of data have been inserted into the application of statistical procedure, which was then interpreted based on the test questions. All of the results obtained from this primary research were via statistical software which contributes to the final conclusions of the paper through the tests' results. This study deals with three research questions; each of them was analyzed in the body of this chapter. The paper looks for sufficient answers of whether pragmatic competence can be raised in the learning classrooms, and what effect can gender of the student have on developing pragmatic competence and can proficiency be considered a great value to acquire competence. In addition, the duration of learning English is compared to the result of the students gained in the pre-test and the post-test.

4.2 Testing the Research Questions

The research questions of the study are tested below via individual tables and descriptive analyses of each result.

4.2.1 Testing the first research question

To answer the first research question, the table below highlights the significance of explicit instruction on L2 learners, which demonstrates the result of the study. This presents that the course was incredibly effective for the participants in developing their pragmatic competence. The purpose of the test is to measure the subjects' progress during the course they attended for two months and the changes made in their pragmatic production.

Table 4.1: The Impact of the Activity on the Students

Test	N	Mean	S.D	Std. error	95% Confidence Lower	Upper	T-test	Sig
Pre-test	50	34.58	7.35	1.04				
					-12.98	-8.62	-9.94	0.00
Post-test	50	45.38	6.45	0.91				

As illustrated in the above table, the mean and standard deviation of pre-test were (34.58, 7.35) respectively and when students have attended the course, the mean result of post- test has increased to (45.38) and standard deviation has decreased to (6.45), which indicates that the group has become more homogeneous. Moreover, there was statistically significant difference between the results in the pre-test and the post-test because the p-value of t-test were smaller than the common alpha (α =0.05). This confirms the influence of the explicit knowledge gained via the curriculum applied for pragmatic development.

4.2.2 Testing the second research question

In responding to the second research question, which covers the relationship between the proficiency level and the development of pragmatic competence. The results show the impact of proficiency in acquiring competence. In table 4.2 students' GPA represents the proficiency level of the subjects that compared to the students' results of the pre-test and the post-test. As mentioned in the methodology chapter, all the participants were

proficient; whose GPA was above 75% was considered proficient. This aims at demonstrating the effect of English proficiency in raising pragmatic competence.

Table 4.2: Statistical Description of the Subjects' GPA within the Pre-test and Post-test

	Pre-test					Post-test				
ANOVA	**Sum of Squares**	**Df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**	**Sum of Squares**	**Df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig**
Between Groups	591.513	21	28.167			746.735	19	39.302		
Within Groups	542.245	28	19.366	1.454	.175	387.021	30	12.901	3.046	.003
Total	1133.75	49				11.33.75	49			

The above table indicates the statistical description of the participants' GPA in the pre-test and the post-test between the groups and within the groups. The result discovered that proficiency of the students was not effective in the pre-test since the P-value was greater than the common alpha ($\alpha = 0.05$) which is (.175). Therefore, we can say that there was a poor relationship between the proficiency and pragmatic competence before attending the pragmatic course. Meanwhile in the post-test, the difference of the result is statistically significant, that is (.003) so this confirms the strength of explicit instruction to the proficient students when taking the post-test. The main aim of the test was to seek for the relationship between subjects' proficiency and raising pragmatic competence, As a result, explicit instruction can be reliant on developing pragmatic competence in classrooms particularly for proficient English learners.

4.2.3 Testing the third research question

The table below shows the result of the third research question that states, gender is a factor affecting the L2 pragmatic competence.

Table 4.3: Gender Impact in the Pre-test and Post-test

	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Male	**Female**	**Male**	**Female**
N	25	25	25	25
Mean	34.44	34.72	44.64	46.16
S. D	6.57	8.19	6.8	6.1
Std. error	1.31	1.63	1.36	1.22
F- Test	0.99		1.17	
Sig.	0.323		0.283	
T- Test	-0.13		-0.808	
Sig.	0.89		0.423	

Table 4.3 indicates the functional role of gender on raising pragmatic competence based on the pre-test and the post-test taken in this study. It is obvious that there was not a statistically significant difference between male and female students because the p-value was bigger than the common alpha (α =0.05). Though the female students performed better than the male ones, the difference between the means are not statistically meaningful. In other words, there was not statistically significant difference between the participants as a result of taking the course. Resultantly, the male and the female participants have been raising their pragmatic competence similarly in classrooms, despite two months of course attendance (Class explicit instruction).

- There are several more comparison tables covering the test items and other segments of the test which all support the goals of the study and research questions of the study through providing more detailed results of the tests. The table below declares what support the length of English learning provides to acquire competence which may also affect raising competence as a secondary factor this why we brought this into attention.

Table 4.4: The Relationship between duration of Learning English in the Pre-Test and Post-test

	Pre-test					**post-test**				
ANOVA	**Sum of Squares**	**Df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**	**Sum of Squares**	**Df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig**
Between Groups	1051.041	8	131.380			310.53	8	38.816		
Within Groups	1599.139	41	39.003	3.368	0.005	1731.25	41	42.226	0.919	0.511
Total	2650.180	49				2041.78	49			

According to the above results of the ANOVA amid the pre-test and the post-test, the significance score of the test is (0.005) which means that the duration of English study was strongly effective in the pre-test since the p-value were smaller than the common alpha ($\alpha = 0.05$). Consequently, duration of learning English is incredibly supportive for obtaining notable results in the pre-test. The length of learning a language often guarantees pragmatic production and recognition in written based contexts. Khalil (2005) explored the magic influence of duration of English study on learner's proficiency in language production. In contrast, the correlation between the length of learning English and the course taken is low and did not make a significant difference in getting higher marks in the post-test if it is compared to the pre-test. However, the degree of freedom are the same between the pre-test and the post-test which is (8) between the groups and (41) within the groups but the significance score is not meaningful in the post-test since it is bigger than the common alpha ($\alpha = 0.05$). Briefly, one can say that the length of English study did not assist the test takers to record a reasonable result in the post-test right after the course they have taken.

Table 4.5: The Comparison the of Pre-Test and Post-Test in Inference

Inference	N	Mean	S.D	Std. error	T-test	Sig
Pre-test	50	7.52	3.09	0.43		
					-2.39	0.021
Post-test	50	8.96	2.62	0.37		

Table 4.5 determines the inferential statistics of students' performance of recognizing inference within both tests. The above comparison aimed at measuring the participants' inferential capacity on written tasks. A statistically significant difference was scored between the beginning and end of the course; the pre-test preceded the course and the post-test followed the completion of the course designate that students obtained higher grades in the post-test of inference part since the p-value were smaller than the common alpha (α= 0.05). Furthermore, the means and standard deviation of inference in the pre-test were (7.52, 3.09) respectively and the mean and standard deviation of inference in the post- test were (8.96, 2.62) respectively. This means that the mean of students' results in post-test have positively increased to (1.44) comparing to those of in the pre-test. As a result, this part of the course was affected by pragmatic-based explicit instruction.

Table 4.6: The Comparison of the Pre-Test and Post-Test in Implicature

Implicature	N	Mean	S.D	Std. error	T-test	Sig
Pre-test	50	5.24	2.52	0.35	-10.33	0.00
Post-test	50	10.06	2.17	0.30		

According to the results presented in Table 4.6, we can say that the students performed better in the post-test and scored a difference as seen in the significance grade (0.00) which was smaller than the common alpha; this was resulted from the attendance in the intensive pragmatic course. Comparatively speaking, the mean of students' results in post-test have significantly increased up to (4.88) grades in comparison to the ones in the pre-test.

Table 4.7: The Comparison of the Pre-Test and Post-Test in Structure, Meaning and Interpretation

Structure, Meaning and Interpretation	N	Mean	S.D	Std. error	T-test	Sig
Pre-test	50	10.86	3.52	0.49		
					-4.52	0.00
Post-test	50	13.4	3.93	0.55		

The data described in the above table, covers the outstanding performance of the participants in the post-test comparing to the pre-test. After two months of explicit input of pragmatics, the students were able to increase the mean score by (2.54); this tells the readers that the difference achieved in the post-test is statically significant. Additionally, the means and standard deviation of structural meaning and interpretation part in the pre-test were (10.86, 3.52) respectively while they have notably increased to (13.4, 3.93) in the post-test. This specifies that the students benefited toughly from the materials applied in the course as well as the instruction they have gained this is why their linguistic competence have been developed.

Table 4.8: The Comparison of the Pre-Test and Post-Test in Speech Acts

Speech Acts	N	Mean	S.D	Std. error	T-test	Sig
Pre-test	50	10.76	2.37	0.33		
					-4.77	0.00
Post-test	50	12.94	2.56	0.36		

The results in Table 4.8 include that the subjects' mean and standard deviation of speech acts in the pre-test were (10.76, 2.37) respectively, but those scores have been raised in the post-test to (12.94, 2.56) respectively. According to the results that were discovered in the statistics description in the above table, speech acts can be taught in foreign language classrooms. The achieved results acknowledge the role of the pragmatic-based course in developing this type of competence in L2 learners.

4.3 Discussion

This part of the paper discusses the data analyzed from the test and the findings of the study. It also individually addresses the research questions of the study and their relevant results from their examination throughout the study. The validity of the findings would be compared to the recent studies regarding raising competence in classrooms.

Interests in second language learning have increasingly been noted round the world because of the hegemony of globalization; specifically, there is a focus on pragmatic competence in L2 learning as it is something believed not to be easily acquired. So there have been lots of studies about learning competence and assessing competence. The outcomes of the study demonstrate the level of second language proficiency influences

the development of pragmatic competence, in relation to the application of pragmatic-based instruction in foreign language classrooms. The results in the previous section illustrate the impact of in-class courses, the duration of language study, students' language fluency, the effects of gender difference and all the anticipated and unanticipated findings. The study aimed to address the following research questions;

1. Can classroom-based explicit instruction develop pragmatic competence?
2. Is there a relationship between L2 proficiency level and pragmatic competence?
3. Is gender a factor affecting the L2 pragmatic competence?

In the body of this section, all the research questions are discussed in the light of the findings. It will highlight the status and reasons behind the achievements in the study. These questions were specified as they are fundamental aspects of pragmatic learning and play various roles in acquiring competence. The discussion begins with addressing the first research question of this study that addresses whether classroom-based explicit instruction can develop pragmatic competence. People are able to learn through different methods of study, such as self-study, tutoring, formal education and informal courses. In reference to the results of this study, students were able to develop their pragmatic production when attending intensive courses of pragmatics since the students scored a significant difference and increased the mean score up to 11 points in the post-test. This progress implies that the course (explicit instruction) was effective. This technique of classroom-based pragmatic teaching is compatible with the findings of Mohammed (2012). He found that instructional courses were quite useful in raising pragmatic competence, mainly when explicit knowledge was given to the participants in EFL classrooms. In addition to the impact of pragmatic explicit instruction, Ishihara (2009) realized that pragmatic-centered course would also contribute in teaching programmatic competence. Her study engaged 58 students, divided into three groups, from a Tokyo university where the instructor herself has prepared the course materials focusing on pragmatics while in this study, a recent published pragmatic course book, *Introduction to Pragmatics* by Betty J. Birner (2013), has been used by the researcher in the pragmatic development course at the university of Sulaimanyah. The results of both

studies predicted that courses of pragmatic competence strongly benefit the participants, resulting in the improved pragmatic production by the end of the courses.

The second research question of the study looks at the relationship between L2 proficiency level and pragmatic competence. It was generally recognized that proficiency is a critical issue and proficiency is recommended if students want to become competent in pragmatic use. The current study confirmed that language proficiency is a contributing factor in raising competence. The subjects' could not score a significant result in the pre-test but it was expected that they would obtain high marks mainly in the post-test (as seen in Table 4.3).The participants were proficient and were able to use English before they have attended the course. They had little background knowledge of pragmatic use in sociocultural context but stimulated them to pass the tests; moreover, their English proficiency enabled them capture explicit instruction from the courses and gradually increased their pragmatic competence; This finding is in line with numbers of studies; Schauer (2009) realized that language proficiency accelerates pragmatic competence and developments; he mentioned the period of living in a native language community would also have an extra value to pragmatic competence. Ishihara (2009) found that proficient students could expectedly learn pragmatics trends in classrooms when instructor has used instructional curriculum designed for this reason. This key question of the study explores whether there are distinct performances between high proficiency and low proficiency of language students in learning pragmatic competence. Ultimately, Taguchi (2011; 2007) announced the prominent impact of proficiency in the listening tasks of pragmatics and achieved that those who had high proficiency have been able to respond more accurately, speedily and efficiently in the test. So proficiency can be considered a key factor causing the development of pragmatic competence in almost all the languages.

The last research question is about the role of gender in learning pragmatic competence. Reiterating the participants' background information, university adult students were nominated to attend this case study. As stated in the participants section, there were 50 participants in the test (25 males and 25 females). It is generally accepted that gender can be one of the factors affecting L2 learning and it is also considered to be a social

variable that plays an influential role in linguistic choice in native speakers (Lenchuk & Ahmed, 2013). However, this study shows that it does not have a significant role in how an individual learns pragmatic competence in accordance with the outcomes that were obtained in the study and the subjects have become homogenous. This supports the claim of similarity between males and females in pragmatic production even if they have attended courses; meaning that the capacity of learning pragmatic is similar. However, Schneider and Barron (2008) stated that gender difference can affect assessing pragmatic competence since macrosocial differences can influence sociocultural practice of language. Another contradicting claim is the study that was conducted by Aslan (2008). He confirmed that there was not a distinct relationship between gender and development in English language. The current study finds that both males and females were likewise competent in the tests, and there was not a significant difference between genders on the pre-test nor the post-test.

The participants' duration of learning English as an L2 was also considered in relation to the tests conducted at the beginning and the end of the course. Learners are able to learn sociocultural norms of the target language through time when practicing the target language for a reasonable period of time. The history of learning English among the participants of the course would probably assist them in getting a statically significant difference in the test results, so the practical performance of pragmatic was noted in the first test (pre-test) but it was not anticipated that the participants would not do so efficiently in the post-test. As it is illustrated in Table 4.4, ANOVA procedure was applied in comparing the data. There was not significant impact of the duration of L2 study on the post-test, unlike the post-test; the relation between the length of English study and pre-test was identifiable. This finding is compatible with the study by Khalil (2005). He found that students with longer duration of L2 learning could apply more language learning strategies in their production. It is possible some students might have misrepresented their duration of learning language, some counted only university time as the actual duration English study while others count high school period as a start date of learning language. However, high school English study courses are not intensive in Iraqi society and the Kurdish region. Nevertheless, university duration of language study is different since the participants have intensively studied English as the detailed were

mentioned in the methodology. This confusion may have affected the results to some extent.

The tests that were conducted as the pre-test and the post-test included four parts; the first part was about inference, part two was implicatures, part three was structure, meaning and interpretation and lastly it was speech acts' requests, apologies, refusals and offer. It is believed that those topics are the core of pragmatic-related topics which have strong relations with competence. I discuss the outcomes and the results of each one of them based on the analyzed data that previously collected in the tests.

The first part of the test was testing the inferential capacity of the learners via three statements so that the students would make inferences out of them. The students did a great job in both tests and mainly in the post-test since they could increase their mean results to (1.44) as seen in Table 4.5. This proves the importance of the curricular course on L2 pragmatics.

The second part of the test was on implicatures. The students could record the highest mean result in this part as seen in Table 4.6, the increase in the mean of the post-test showed an incredible development in the pragmatic capacity of the participants which is by the rate of (4.88); therefore, the courses-based curriculum on a hand and the proficiency on the other hand had unforgettable inspiring impact on the test takers. This achievement of the study is positively attuned with the findings of Taguchi (2011). Taguchi found that proficiency has an unbelievable influence on implicatures, particularly in listening test. Students would have been able to execute the test faster and more efficiently. Another researcher found that the students who have got explicit instruction in implicatures performed better in the post-test than those in the control group (Bouton, 1994).

In part three of the test, the students have been examined in structural meaning and interpretation of sentences. This part of the test has included five sentences with distinct types of errors such as grammatical (syntax), semantic (meaning) and pragmatic (appropriateness) of the given sentences. The participants needed to decide the types of errors first and then justify their choice. After 8 total weeks from the pre-test, the

students took the post-test which was the same test items and the same time was provided to the students. In the pre-test, it was noted from the students' answer sheets that the test takers were able to highlight grammatical errors much easier than other kinds of errors available in the sentences; such as pragmatic errors. In the pre-test, the students would hardly select the error types and justify them but the students' general accuracy in the post-test have been well-noted. Several examples are extracted from part three of the pre-test and the post-test (See the Appendix A) in order to present what typical written mistakes students made and what development they have got during the two months of class instruction;

(1) Pre-test: subject's response to the first item of part three of the test (female #1)

"Two different meaning within scope of the situation".

Analysis: There are few grammatical errors in the above response, first the answer is indirect and not clear enough what the student exactly meant, secondly the numerical words was used "two" so a plural word should follow it, it should be meanings instead of "meaning".

(2) Post-test: subject's response to the first item of part three of the test (female #1)

"There is no logical relationship between driving a car and a yellow hat".

Analysis: The response here is much clear than the one in the pre-test. In the pre-test, the testes could not interpret the meaning well while in the post-test, positive progress was demonstrated in the student's pragmatic ability.

(3) Pre-test: subject's response to the first item of part three of the test (male #33)

NA/ "Combining the words is not understandable".

(4) Post-test: subject's response to the first item of part three of the test (male #33)

NA/ "You cannot drive with hat, cannot go together".

Analysis: The student in (4) finds out that the word "hat" is odd in the sentence and it does not have anything to do with "driving". There is a subject verb agreement error in the pre-test sample (3) as used "is" instead of a plural auxiliary verb. Interestingly, the student has chosen the right error types, Not Appropriate, and he could interpret the sentence better and focus on meaning, not just on form as in (3).

(5) Pre-test: subject's response to the second item of part three of the test (female #9)

NG/ "The structure of the sentence is ill-formed".

(6) Post-test: subject's response to the second item of part three of the test (female #9)

NG/ "The sentence is syntactically wrong".

Analysis: The female's given answers are correct in both tests; however, the answer in (6) is much accurate than the one in (5).

(7) Pre-test: subject's response to the second item of part three of the test (male #27)

NG/ "The structure of the sentence is odd".

(8) Post-test: subject's response to the second statement of part three of the test (male #27)

NG/ "The object should come after the verb".

Analysis: The testes could recognize the types of errors exist in the questions easily and even specified the error in (8); though the female's responses in (5) and (6) were quite direct and meaningful comparing to those of the male one as in (7) and (8). One can simply admit that the form-focuses instruction can be learnt quicker than the meaning among L2 learners.

(9) Pre-test: subject's response to the third item of part three of the test (female #6)

NG/ "It is not well formed".

(10) Post-test: subject's response to the third item of part three of the test (female #6)

NA/ "The sentence does not make sense that way. The second part of the sentence is vague".

Analysis: Student (6) has first expressed that the statement is not grammatically well-formed then she changed her mind in (10) and demonstrated that the statement cannot pragmatically give a clear meaning since the second part of statement is syntactically inappropriate.

(11) Pre-test: subject's response to the third item of part three of the test (male #31)

NG/ "The second part has order problems".

(12) Post-test: subject's response to the third item of part three of the test (male #31)

NG/ "In the second part of the sentence, the word animal should take subject position".

Analysis: The test taker in (11) states that the syntactic error has affected the meaning of the statement but he has specifically indicated the grammatical error in the statement and has provided the correct form of the statement as seen in (12). As it can be noted from the sample answers provided to third item, any syntactic error would affect linguistic and pragmatic meaning of the sentence as it confuses the readers as a result.

(13)   Pre-test: subject's response to the fourth item of part three of the test (female #9)

NM/ "The sentence is not meaningful".

(14)   Post-test: subject's response to the fourth item of part three of the test (female #9)

NA/ "Sister and man cannot match together".

Analysis: The student did well in (13) when she stated that the statement is not pragmatically appropriate; however, she did not justify her choice precisely but she was much specific in the post-test as in (14) and illustrated that gender should not be misused and the statement is not socio-culturally appropriate.

(15)   Pre-test: subject's response to the fourth item of part three of the test (male #38)

NG/ "There is no subject object agreement".

(16)   Post-test: subject's response to the fourth item of part three of the test (male #38)

NA/ "Sister can be a woman, not a man".

Analysis: The response in (15) does not seem to be correct and it is not quite relevant to the given statement. The post-test showed that the student has developed and given a considerable response to the statement and he justified the inappropriateness of the statement.

(17)   Pre-test: subject's response to the fifth item of part three of the test (female #18)

NA/ "Something is wrong with this statement".

(18)   Post-test: subject's response to the fifth item of part three of the test (female #18)

NM/ "The first and the second part of the sentence contradict in meaning".

Analysis: The response of (17) is indirect and a sufficient difference is recorded in the answers given in both (17) and (18) since the testes has performed well in the post-test and she expressed the reason of her choice of the error which affected the semantic meaning of the statement. The female student could reveal the contradiction of the statement between the word "full mark" and "passed" since pass degree does not logically need full mark.

(19)   Pre-test: subject's response to the fifth item of part three of the test (male #40)

NG/ "Passive voice was used in the second sentence which is syntactically impossible".

(20)   Post-test: subject's response to the fifth item of part three of the test (male #40)

NM/ "How come! when someone get full marks and just simply pass".

Analysis: The male student looked astonished when replying the statement in the post-test; however, he seemed really careless in the pre-test (19). Unlike the post-test, he believed that there is a syntactic error in the statement and he has gone far away from the correct answer but he could make it in the post-test and realized that the statement is not semantically meaningful.

Generally speaking, the students were able to perform better in the structural meaning and interpretation part and increased the mean to 2.54 in the post-test, it is not just a new style of questions the subjects encountered but also the most difficult part of the test so this increasing score implies the powerful side of proficiency that let the students comprehend and capture a lot about pragmatic competence in the course and reflect it on their performance in the post-test. Félix-Brasdefer and Cohen (2012) studied that grammar as a communicative resource as well as the possibility of teaching pragmatic; the proved that students would certainly remember the grammatical rules rather than comprehending the pragmatic function of those rules. Additionally, they suggested that pragmatic can be taught from the very begging level of L2 learners.

The last part of the test was about speech acts that comprised requests, apologies, refusal and offers; four situational scenarios have been presented with specific questions to be answered by the test takers. The students answered well enough to be able to increase the mean result in the post test-by the rate of (2.18) as it is seen in Table 4.9. Thus one can formulate a thought that students' participation in the course had a great value on their pragmatic development, particularly written based skills. Linguistically speaking, the course takers had learnt a lot regarding the practice of pragmatic competence. There have been several recent studies about speech acts which are nearly in line with the findings of the current study; as previously mentioned in the literature review, Su (2010) examined Chinese EFL learners on the transference of the bi-directionality of both L1 and L2 with the focus of speech act of request. The main purpose of this part of the test was how much proficiency and course attendance cope together to raise speech acts ability. F´elix- Brasdefer (2007) found that students with high proficiency used fewer direct requests than those with low or intermediate level of proficiency. In the current study, the researcher observed that most of the test takers in the pre-test have used indirect approach, not only in requests but also in apology, offer and refusal. In contrast, they have applied polite or direct method of requesting, apologizing, offering and refusal in the post-test caused by the explicit knowledge they have learnt in the special course of pragmatic development. Lastly recent researches demonstrated the profound impact of curricular courses for pragmatic development, mainly when the students were enriched with explicit knowledge of request and refusal (Mohammed, 2012). Dalmau and Gotor (2007) found that high proficiency has a great impact on making apology expressions and high proficient students avoided over-generalization use in their responses. They have applied WDCT in their study and we have used the same assessing tool in the current study.

Ultimately, teacher training is a critical issue in the area of pragmatic-based courses; it was observed that most of the pragmatic instructors are in need of advanced training courses so as to teach students pragmatics in the most effective methodology then the students will be able to make pragmatic production properly and gain countless knowledge regarding the development of pragmatic competence. McNamara and Rover (2006) indicated that teacher training is absolutely essential for pragmatic instructors

because as much as they can be aware of the method of teaching pragmatic, they would intentionally plan their courses well based on the students' needs. Another researcher recommended that instructors should develop their own methods of pragmatic teaching rather than just giving theory to the learners (Va´squez & Sharpless, 2009).

5. CONCLUSION

5.1 Conclusion

Pragmatics can be taught in EFL classrooms through intensive curricular courses primarily when learners have reached a considerable level of proficiency before the exposure to the designed pragmatic course of work. The study tested 50 proficient university students to measure the development of pragmatic competence in foreign language classrooms via WDCT, which was leading to few outcomes. Pragmatic competence can interestingly be raised on the condition that the class environment is entirely designed to pragmatic production and development in terms of well-developed curriculum, explicit instruction, learners' interaction and engagement in the activities, instructors' awareness of the participants' needs, and application of multi-curricular activities in class. Gender was not relevant in the development of pragmatic competence, but rather participants' willingness to learn pragmatic was of upmost importance. Proficient students are able to raise pragmatic competence if attending a class with explicit instruction. Consequently, the duration of English study was beneficial particularly in the pre-test but was less practical in the post-test.

5.2 Limitations of the Study

The current study had several limitations in studying raising pragmatic competence through classroom explicit instruction and the effect of proficiency in being pragmatically competent. The limitation of the study resulted from the time-frame of the course, division of the groups, and the impracticality of having control group.

The period of the pragmatic-based course was only two months and could not be extended in order to provide more instructions to the participants since it was an entire

university semester and the instructional course should have ended before the final exam.

Another limitation of the study was the random division of the groups; both groups were experimental and all were high proficient students but they were placed in the groups with varying GPA grades; otherwise the groups could be compared in terms of the GPA effect in the pre-test and the post-test.

Lastly, having control groups could have enriched the study but it sounded impossible because of the tight schedule of the courses and limited teaching spaces the faculty had, this is why we could not make an experimental study.

5.3 Recommendations and Suggestions for Further Studies

It is recommended for the majority of the pragmatic instructors to be trained with strategies of pragmatic teaching and apply the methods accordingly. They should utilize appropriate pragmatic-based curricula for their learners that are appropriate for their proficiency level. Furthermore, it is better for the instructors, schools, and institutional agents to organize magnificent learning environment in the classroom for the learners in terms of materials, curriculum, teaching facilities and visual means. There should be motivational feedback to learners of pragmatic competence in order to develop their understanding. Uncovering mutual relations between L2, English and L1 of the target community, Kurdish so that the learners will be able to interact and engage in the class.

There are several concerns in researching pragmatic competence area that should be taken into consideration by the researchers and be considered for further study. First, researchers should conduct studies enhancing the self-assessment approach in language classes and pragmatic classrooms in particular. Identifying the effect of gender on pragmatic competence in segregated classes; male experimental group and female experimental group would also provide relevant insight into pragmatic learning. Further study should also look into the development of pragmatic competence as a self-study. Lastly what makes pragmatic an interesting topic for learners can be an interesting

research topic for researchers (what motivation). Further researches in any pragmatic-related topics would enrich the area of pragmatic knowledge.

REFERENCES

Achiba, M. (2003). *Learning to request in a second language: child interlanguage pragmatics.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Aslan, O. (2009). *The role of gender and language learning strategies in learning English* (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University).

Auerbach, E. R., (1993)**.** Reexamining English Only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 9-32.

Aufa, F., (2013). The Assessment Tool of L2 Learners "Pragmatic Competence: Written Discourse Completion Test (WDCT). *International Proceedings of Economics Development and Research*, 68, p.113.

Bachman, L. E., (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Mahan-Taylor, R. (2003). Teaching pragmatics. *Washington, DC: United States Department of State.*

Bardovi-Harlig, K., &Dörnyei, Z. (1997). *Pragmatic awareness and instructed L2 learning: An empirical investigation.* Paper presented at the AAAL 1997 Conference, Orlando, March.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1996). Pragmatics and language teaching: Bringing pragmatics and pedagogy together. *Pragmatics and Language Learning*, 7, 21–39.

Barraja-Rohan, A. M. (2003). How can we make Australian English meaningful to ESL learners? In J. Lo Bianco & C. Crozet (Eds.), *Teaching invisible culture: Classroom practice and theory* (pp. 101–108). Melbourne: Language Australia.

Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in Interlanguage Pragmatics: Learning How To Do Things with Words in a Study Abroad Context.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bialystok, E. (1993). Symbolic representation and attentional control in pragmatic competence. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 43–58). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Birner, B. J. (2013). *Introduction to pragmatics*. Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, A John Wiley & Sons,, Publication.

Block, D. (2002). Language & Gender and SLA. *Quaderns de Filologia. Estudis Linguistics*. Vol VII, 49-73.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J. and Kasper, G. (1989). Investigating cross-cultural pragmatics: An introductory overview. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House and G. Kasper (eds) *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies* (pp. 1_34). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Bouton, L.F. (1994). Conversational implicature in the second language: Learned slowly when not deliberately taught. *Journal of Pragmatics* 22, 157–67.

Brown, H. D., & Hudson, T. (1998). The alternatives in language assessment. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 653-675.

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment*: Principles and classroom practices. New York: Longman.

Brown, J. D. (2001). Pragmatics tests: Different purposes, different tests. In K. Rose &G.Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 301-325). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Canale, M & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-47.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, A. (2004). Assessing speech acts in a second language. In D. Boxer & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), *Studying speaking to inform second language learning* (pp. 302 327). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Cohen, A. (2008). Teaching and assessing L2 pragmatics: What can we expect from learners? *Language Teaching, 41*, 213–235.

Coombe, C., Folse, K., & Hubley, N. (2007). *A practical Guide to Assessing English Language Learners*. USA: The University of Michigan Press.

Crandall, E. & Basturkmen, H. (2004). Evaluating pragmatics-focused materials. *ELT Journal*, 58, 38-49.

Crystal, D. (1985). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*.2nd edition. Oxford: Blackwell.

Dalmau, M. S., &Gotor, H. C.m (2007). Form "sorry very much" to "I'm ever so sorry": Acquisitional patterns in *L2 apologies* by Catalan learners of English. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 4(2), 287–315.

Davison, C., & Leung L. (2009). Current issues in English language teacher-based assessment.*TESOL Quarterly* 43(3).393–415.

Ellis, R., (1990). *Instructed second language acquisition.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Enochs, K., &Yoshitake-Strain, S., (1999). Evaluating six measures of EFL learners' pragmatic competence. *JALTJourn*al, 21, 29-50.

Eslami-Rasekh. (2005). Raising the pragmatic awareness of language learners. *ELT Journal* 59(3).199–208.

F´elix-Brasdefer, J. C., (2003) Declining an invitation: A cross-cultural study of pragmatic strategies in American English and Latin American Spanish, *Multilingua,* 22, 225–255.

F´elix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2007). Pragmatic development in the Spanish as a FL classroom: A cross-sectional study of learner requests. *Intercultural Pragmatics,* 4(2), 253–286.

Félix-Brasdefer, J. C., & Cohen, A. D. (2012). Teaching Pragmatics in the Foreign Language Classroom: Grammar as a Communicative Resource. *Hispania,* 95(4), 650-669.

Fox, J. (2008). Alternative assessment. In E. Shohamy& N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education*: Vol. 7. Language testing and assessment (2nd ed.; pp. 97-108). New York: Springer Science+Business Media.

Garcia, P. (2004). Developmental differences in speech act recognition: A pragmatic awareness study. *Language Awareness*, 13, 96–115.

Giles, H., Coupland, J., &Coupland, N. (Eds.). (1991). *Contexts of accommodation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grossi, V. (2009). Teaching pragmatic competence: Compliments and compliment responses in the *ESL classroom*.

Holmes, J., & Brown, D. (1987). Teachers and students learning about compliments.*TESOL Quarterly*, 21(3), 523–546.

Hudson, T., Detmer, E. and Brown, J. D. (1995). Developing prototypic measures of cross-cultural pragmatics. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, *Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.*

Huerta-Macias, A. (1995). Alternative assessment: Responses to commonly asked questions. *TESOL Journal*, 5, 8-11.

Hughes, A. (1989). *Testing for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, H. D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), Sociolinguisitics: Selected readings (pp. 269–293). Middlesex, UK: Penguin.

Hymes, H. D. (1977). Foundations in Sociolinguistics. London: Tavistock Publications.

Ishihara, N. and Cohen, A., (2010). Teaching and learning pragmatics: where language and culture meet. Harlow,UK: Pearson Education.

Ishihara, N. (2006). *Subjectivity, second/foreign language pragmatic use, and instruction: Evidence of accommodation and resistance.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Ishihara, N. (2009). Teacher-based assessment for foreign language pragmatics.*TESOL Quarterly* 43(3). 445–70

Ishihara, N. (2010). Instructional pragmatics: Bridging teaching, research, and teacher education. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 4(10), pp.938-953.

Jeon, E. H. and Kaya, T. (2006). Effects of L2 instruction on interlanguage pragmatic development: a meta-analysis. *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching*, ed. by John Michael Norris and Lourdes Ortega, 165–211. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Jones, K. (2007). The development of pragmatic competence in children learning Japanese as a second language. *Selected Papers from Pragmatics in the CJK Classroom*: the State of the Art, ed. by Dina R. Yoshimi and Haidan Wang. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

Kanagy, R. and Igarashi, **K.** (1997).Acquisition of pragmatic competence in a Japanese immersion kindergarten.*Pragmatics and language learning,* monograph series, ed. by Larry Bouton, Vol. 8, 243–65. Urbana-Champaign, IL, University of Illinois, Division of English as an International Language.

Kanagy, R. (1999). Interactional routines as a mechanism for L2 acquisition and socialization in an immersion context. *Journal of Pragmatics 31(11).1467 92.*

Karatza, S. (2009). Assessing C1 KPG Candidates' Pragmatic Competence in Written Tasks: Towards the design of Task-Specific Rating Scales, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens.

Kasper, G. and Schmidt, R. (1996). Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 18(2).149–69.

Kasper, G., & Roever, C. (2005). Pragmatics in second language learning.In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *the handbook of research in second language learning* (pp. 317–334).Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2001). *Pragmatics in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: University Press.

Kasper, G. (1989). Variation in interlanguage speech act realization. In S. Gass, C. Madden, D. Preston, & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Variation in second language acquisition:* Vol. 1. Pragmatics and discourse (pp. 37–58).Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Kasper, G. (1996). Introduction: Interlanguage pragmatics in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18*, 125-148.

Kasper, G. (1997). Can pragmatic competence be taught? (NetWork #6) Honolulu: University of Hawaii, *Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center*.

Kasper, G. (2007). Pragmatics in second language learning: An update. *Language learning celebrates 30 years of AAAL*.

Khalil, A. (2005). Assessment of language learning strategies used by Palestinian EFL learners. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38(1), 108-119.

Kim, D., & Hall, J. K. (2002). The Role of an Interactive Book Reading Program in the Development of Second Language Pragmatic Competence.*Modern Language Journal*

Kinginger, C. (2008). Language learning in study abroad: Case studies of Americans in France [Monograph]. *Modern Language Journal, 92*, 1–124.

Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and Culture in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J. P. and Thorne, S. L. (2006).Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J. P. (2000). Sociocultural theory and second language learning. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lee, J. and McChesney, B. (2000). Discourse rating tasks: a teaching tool for developing socioculturalcompetence. *ELT Journal* 54(2).161–8.

Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman, London.

Lenchuk, I. and Ahmed, A. 2013. Teaching pragmatic competence: A journey from teaching cultural facts to teaching cultural awareness. *TESL Canada Journal*, 30(7).

Liu, J. (2006a). Assessing EFL learners' interlanguage pragmatic knowledge: Implications for testers and teachers. *Reflections on English language teaching*, 5(1), pp.1-22.

Liu, J. (2006b). *Measuring Interlanguage Pragmatic Knowledge of EFL Learners*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang Publishing.

Liu, J. (2007). Developing a pragmatics test for Chinese EFL learners. *Language Testing*, 24, 391-415.

LoCastro, V. (2003).*An introduction to pragmatics*: Social action for language teachers. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Long, M. H., Adams, L., McLean, M., & Castaños, F. (1976). Doing things with words - Verbal interaction in lockstep and small group classroom situations. In Brown, H.D., Yorio, C. A., &Crymes, R. H. (Eds.), Teaching and learning English as a second language: Trends in research and practice (pp. 137-153). Washington, DC: *TESOL.*

Lörscher, W. (1986).Conversational structures in the foreign language classroom. In G. Kasper (Ed.), Learning, *teaching and communication in the foreign language classroom* (pp. 11-22).Århus: Aarhus University Press.

Lörscher, W., & Schulze, R. (1988). On polite speaking and foreign language classroom discourse. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 26, 183-199.

Lynch, B. K. (2001). Rethinking assessment from a critical perspective. *Language Testing*, 18, 351-372.

Lynch, B., & Shaw, P. (2005). Portfolios, power, and ethics. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 263-297.

Maeshiba, N., Kasper, G., & Ross, S. (1996). Transfer and proficiency in interlanguage apologizing. In S. Gass& J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures* (pp. 155–187). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Martínez-Flor, A., Usó Juan, E. and Fernández Guerra, A. (eds.) (2003). *Pragmatic competence and foreign language teaching.* Castellón: Universitat Jaume I

McNamara, T. F., & Roever, C. (2006). The social dimension of proficiency: How test able is it? In *Language testing*: The social dimension (pp. 43-79). Maiden, MA: Blackwell. Merriam, S. B

McNamara, T. (1996).*Measuring Second Language Performance*. London: Longman.

McNamara, T., (2000).*Language Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mohammed, M. M. (2012). Teach ability of Pragmatic Competence: The Impact of Explicit Instruction on the Development of Iraqi Freshmen EFL Learners' Pragmatic Competence. *Arab Gulf Journal*, (Vol. 40, 1 -2)

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Ohta, A. S. (2005). Interlanguage pragmatics in the zone of proximal development. System 33(3).503–17.

Oller, J. W. (1979). *Language Tests at School*: A pragmatic approach. London: Longman.

Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. (1989). Speech act behavior across languages. In H. W. Dechert& M. Raupach (Eds.), *Transfer in language production* (pp. 53–67).Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

O'Malley, M., & Valdez Pierce, L. (1996).Authentic assessment for English language learners. White Plains, NY: Addison-Wesley.

Pinto, D. (2005).The acquisition of requests by second language learners of Spanish. Spanish in Context, 2, 1–27.

Poehner, M. (2007). Beyond the test: L2 dynamic assessment and the transcendence of mediated learning. *Modern Language Journal*, 91, 323-340.

Poehner, M. (2009). Group dynamic assessment: mediation for the L2 Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*43(3).471–91. Poole, Deborah. 1992. Language socialization in the second language classroom. *Language Learning* 42(4).593–616.

R¨over, C. (2005). *Testing EFL pragmatics*. Frankfurt: Gunter Narr.

Rea-Dickins, P. (2008). Classroom-based language assessment. In E. Shohamy& N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education*: Vol. 7. Language testing and assessment, 2nd ed. (pp. 257-271). New York: Springer Science+Business Media.

Richards, J. C., Platt, J. T., & Platt, H. (1993). *Longman Dictionary of language Teaching & Applied Linguistics*. London: Longman.

Robinson, K. R., (1992). Introspective methodology in interlanguage pragmatics research.In G. Kasper (Ed.), Pragmatics of Japanese as native and target language (Tech. Rep No.3). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Manoa, *Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.*

Rose, K. R. (2000). An exploratory cross-sectional study of interlanguage pragmatic development. Studies in *Second Language Acquisition* 22(1). 27–67.

Rose, K. R., (2005).On the effects of instruction in second language pragmatics.System 33(3).385–99.

Schauer, G. (2009). Interlanguage pragmatic development*: The study abroad context*. London: Continuum.

Schneider K. P., and Barron, A. (eds), (2008). Variational pragmatics. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Shimizu, T. (2009). Influence of learning environment on L2 pragmatic realization: A comparison between JSL and JFL learners' compliment responses. In N. Taguchi (Ed.), *Pragmatic competence* (pp. 167–198). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Shmais, W. (2003). Language learning strategy use in Palestine. *TESL-EJ*, 7(2). Retrieved from http://tesl-ej.org/ej26/a3.html.

Shohamy, E. (2001). Democratic assessment as an alternative. *Language Testing*, 18, 373-391.

Siegal, M. (1996). The role of learner subjectivity in second language sociolinguistic competency: Western women learning Japanese. *Applied Linguistics*, 17, 356-382.

Su, I.R. (2010). Transfer of Pragmatic competences: A bi-directional perspective. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), pp.87-102.

Taguchi, N. (2007). Task difficulty in oral speech act production. *Applied Linguistics*, 28, 113–135.

Taguchi, N. (2008). Pragmatic comprehension in Japanese as a foreign language. *Modern Language Journal*, 92, 558–576.

Taguchi, N. (2011). The Effect of L2 Proficiency and Study-Abroad Experience on Pragmatic Comprehension. *Language Learning*, 61(3), 904-939.

Takahashi, S., &Dufon, M. A. (1989). Cross-linguistic influence in indirectness: The case of English directives performed by native Japanese speakers. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED370439)

Takahashi, S. (1996).Pragmatic transferability. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18, 189–223.

Takahashi, T., & Beebe, L. (1987).The development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of English.*JALT Journal*, 8, 131–158.

Takimoto, M. (2008). The effects of deductive and inductive instruction on the development of language learners' pragmatic competence. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92(3), pp.369-386.

Tatsuki, D.(ed). (2005). Pragmatics in Language Learning, Theory and Practice. Tokyo: JALT, *the Japan Association for Language Teaching*, Pragmatics Special Interest Group.

Tedick, D. J. (Ed.). (2002). Proficiency-oriented language instruction and assessment: A curriculum handbook for teachers. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, *the Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition.*

Thomas, J. (1983) Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. Applied Linguistics 4, 91_112.Trosborg, A. (1987) Apology strategies in natives/non-natives. *Journal of Pragmatics* 11, 147_167.

Va´squez, C. & Sharpless, D. (2009). The role of pragmatics in the master's TESOL curriculum: findings from a nationwide survey. *TESOL Quarterly* 43(1).5–28.

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

Wood, D., Bruner, J., & Ross, G., (1976).The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, and Allied Disciplines, 17, 89-100.

Xu, W., Case, R.E., & Wang, Y. (2009).Pragmatic and grammatical competence, *length of residence, and overall L2 proficiency*. System, 37, 205–216.

Yamanaka, J. E. (2003). Effects of proficiency and length of residence on the pragmatic comprehension of Japanese ESL learners. *Second Language Studies*, 22, 107–175.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Tests on Pragmatic Competence

Part I: Please read the sentences below and write what you infer from each sentence in the blanks provided.

a. Baran forgot to review for the mid-term exam and got a D.

…………………………………………………………………………….

b. Khuncha opened her book to read.

…………………………………………………………………………...

c. Last night, my father waved and then left.

……………………………………………………………………………..

Part II: Please provide the explanations in the spaces provided below

a. The teacher stated "It's too cold in here". What does the speaker mean?

………………………………………………………………………………

b. He finished most of the report. What does the man mean?

……………………………………………………………………………….

c. Please explain the meaning of each sentence in the blank provided below.

1. Yesterday I shouted at my boss and got fired at work.

……………………………………………………………………………..

2. Yesterday I got fired and shouted at my boss at work.

……………………………………………………………………………..

Part III. Please circle the choice and justify your reason.

NOT GRAMMATICAL (NG) / NOT MEANINGFUL (NM)/ NOT APPROPRIATE (NA)

1. Last month I bought a car. I drove the car with the yellow hat.

   a. NG   b. NM   c. NA

WHY:……………………………………………………………………………………….

2. Car I drove with hat yellow.

   a.NG   b. NM   c. NA

WHY:……………………………………………………………………………………….

3. I saw a strange animal yesterday; on the mountain was the animal.

   a. NG   b. NM   c. NA

WHY:……………………………………………………………………………………….

4. My sister is the cutest man I have ever known

   a. NG   b. NM   c. NA

WHY:……………………………………………………………………………………….

5. I got full mark in the quiz; however I was just passed.

   a. NG   b. NM   c. NA

WHY:……………………………………………………………………………………….

Part IV: Read the situations below and write what you say in each one.

1. You are at the airport with two big suitcases; they are too heavy for you to carry. You see a young man standing next to you. You turn to him and say

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

2. You are in the math class using a calculator, after class you collect your goods and stationary. When you review the notes from class and doing home works at home, you realize that the calculator is not yours, it's your classmate's. Next day you come over to him and say

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

3. You are going to refuse an invitation that offered to you by one of your professors to his seminar about modernism in English literature. What would you say?

....

4. You once go out for a walk and suddenly meet an old friend; you haven't met for a while. You are going to offer him a hot drink at a nearby coffee shop. What would you say?

…………………………………………………………………………………………..

Appendix B:

T.C.
İSTANBUL AYDIN ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü

Sayı   : 88083623-044-2283   21/04/2016
Konu : NADHIM OTHMAN NAJMALDDIN
         Etik Kurul Onay Hk.

Sayın NADHIM OTHMAN NAJMALDDIN

Enstitümüz Y1412.020021 numaralı İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Ana Bilim Dalı İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Tezli Yüksek Lisans programı öğrencilerinden NADHIM OTHMAN NAJMALDDIN' in "RAISING PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOMS" adlı tez çalışması gereği "Consent Form" ile ilgili anketi 18.04.2016 tarih ve 2016/06 İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi Etik Komisyon Kararı ile etik olarak uygun olduğuna karar verilmiştir.

Bilgilerinize rica ederim.

Prof. Dr. Zafer UTLU
Müdür

Evrakı Doğrulamak İçin : https://evrakdogrula.aydin.edu.tr/enVision.Dogrula/BelgeDogrulama.aspx?V=BEKV4220

Adres:Beşyol Mah. İnönü Cad. No:38 Sefaköy , 34295 Küçükçekmece / İSTANBUL   Bilgi için: Canan TOPDEMİR
Telefon:444 1 428   Unvanı: Enstitü Sekreteri
Elektronik Ağ:http://www.aydin.edu.tr/

Appendix C: The Females' Scores in the Pre-Test and the Post-Test (1-25)

N	GPA	Pre-test	Post-test
1	80	37	50
2	75.2	43	48
3	90.8	51	56
4	79	49	56
5	75.1	26	48
6	76.3	34	49
7	78	35	48
8	79	35	48
9	78.5	34	48
10	77	30	35
11	76.1	22	38
12	79	38	43
13	82.4	40	46
14	88.6	25	52
15	90.33	34	52
16	84.7	33	49
17	89.1	40	48
18	77.8	28	37
19	79.7	27	50
20	88	39	52
21	78.8	29	45
22	76.7	21	43
23	83.5	29	40
24	80.4	42	48
25	76.9	29	47

Appendix D: The Males' Scores in the Pre-Test and the Post-Test (26-50)

N	GPA	Pre-test	Post-test
26	77.8	31	40
27	75.5	34	48
28	80	34	44
29	79.4	40	48
30	82.4	39	47
31	80.1	41	49
32	93.1	51	57
33	88.9	42	53
34	76.7	38	42
35	77.8	43	48
36	75.1	26	37
37	89.3	38	51
38	85.2	32	52
39	83.8	22	53
40	75.2	30	40
41	78.1	32	34
42	80.6	30	49
43	76.4	30	37
44	78.8	32	40
45	83.1	35	48
46	86.3	37	49
47	76.6	30	38
48	78.9	41	37
49	77.9	25	35
50	80.6	30	33

Appendix E: Activity and Task Materials

1- Week one

a week after (7a) is uttered, *supercilious* will still mean "arrogant and disdainful." Thus, sense is a context-independent, purely semantic notion, whereas determination of reference may require access to pragmatic information.

1.2.2.3   Speaker meaning vs. sentence meaning

The distinction between sense and reference described in the previous section is related to the distinction between **sentence meaning** and **speaker meaning**. Sentence meaning is the literal meaning of a sentence, derivable from the sense of its words and the syntax that combines them. Sentence meaning is "sense" as applied to entire clauses rather than individual words and phrases. Speaker meaning, on the other hand, is the meaning that a speaker intends, which usually includes the literal meaning of the sentence but may extend well beyond it. Thus, consider (8):

(8)   I'm cold.

The sentence meaning here is straightforward: The speaker is cold. The speaker's meaning in using this utterance in a given context, however, could be any of a number of things, including:

(9)   a.   Close the window.
        b.   Bring me a blanket.
        c.   Turn off the air conditioner.
        d.   Snuggle up closer.
        e.   The heater is broken again.
        f.   Let's go home. [uttered, say, at the beach]

The possibilities are limited only by one's imagination. (One could imagine, for example, a rather dull crime novel in which the phrase *I'm cold* is used as a code to mean *We steal the jewels at midnight* – a case in which the sentence meaning is not, in fact, part of the speaker meaning.) Speaker meaning is also sometimes called *utterance meaning*; if you recall the difference between a sentence (which is an abstract entity) and an utterance (an instance in which a sentence is actually used), you will see that the meaning of a sentence is context-independent, whereas the meaning of an utterance is context-dependent and depends in particular on the intentions of the speaker. Speaker meaning, therefore, is a pragmatic notion, while sentence meaning is semantic.

1.2.2.4   Possible worlds and discourse models

Although we talk about linguistic communication as though it involved a straight-forward transfer of information – saying things like *I got my ideas across* or *Let me give you my thoughts on that* or *He conveyed several notions to us in his*

hero. The problem, however, is that in order to determine that *he* has the speaker's uncle as its referent requires access to pragmatic information – in this case, the earlier part of the sentence. That is, the lexical, invariant, context-independent meaning of the word *he* says nothing about uncles. You might counter that this can be handled syntactically – that perhaps the structure of the sentence tells us that the two are coreferential, and therefore we can have syntax, rather than pragmatics, provide the referent of *he*. Unfortunately, the problem remains when the two references occur in separate sentences:

(16) My uncle was a war hero. He fought in major battles.

Now there is no syntactic connection between *my uncle* and *he*; yet the determination of truth conditions for the second sentence is dependent on our making the connection between the two – a connection that is made pragmatically, due to the salience of the uncle at the time the word *he* is uttered. Undaunted, you might then protest that we could build salience and gender, and even animacy, into the semantic meaning of the word *he*, such that *he* means something like "the most salient animate male in the current context." In that case, the second sentence in (16) would semantically mean "the most salient animate male in the current context fought in major battles." But that account suffers from two problems: First, it essentially builds the pragmatics into the semantics, muddying the distinction between the two. Second, it's not supported by our intuitions. Consider (17a–b):

(17) a. A: My dad was an officer in the Navy.
     B: Yeah? My uncle was a war hero.
     A: He fought in major battles.
     B: So did my uncle.
   b. A: My dad was an officer in the Navy.
     B: Yeah? My uncle was a war hero.
     A: He may have fought in major battles, but my dad actually saved
      a guy's life.

In (17a), by using *he*, speaker A is not referring to the most recently mentioned, and therefore arguably the most salient, male. Nonetheless, while we might find the conversation a bit awkward, we certainly would not accuse speaker A of saying something false by using *he* to refer to A's own father if the father but not the uncle had fought in major battles. And while one might argue that the uncle is perhaps not the most salient male in the context despite being most recently mentioned, that would leave open the question of why *he* in (17b) does seem to be used in reference to the uncle, despite the similarity of the prior contexts in the two discourses. In both cases, the truth or falsity of the utterance depends on the intended referent of *he* and whether that individual fought in major battles,

events happened. It doesn't matter what order they happened in; (21) is equally true if Jane set the hors d'oeuvres down in front of the narrator and Konrad before bringing them into the living room. That is, the ordering is not part of what is **said** in (21). Where, then, does the inference of ordering come from?

This is the question that philosopher H.P. Grice set out to answer in his famous paper "Logic and Conversation" (Grice 1975). He observed that what we mean when we use a word like *and* in conversation generally goes well beyond its truth-conditional meaning of logical conjunction. Interestingly, this additional meaning is not necessarily constant; *and*, for example, can mean different things in different contexts:

(23) a. Bill opened a book and began to read.
    b. Yesterday I ate three meals and took two naps.
    c. Jennifer forgot to study for her algebra exam and got a D.

In (23a), we see the same inference of ordering that we saw above in (21); here, the addressee infers that Bill first opened the book and then began to read. This inference is absent, however, in (23b); here, there is no suggestion that the speaker's three meals were prior to the two naps. Finally, in (23c), there is an inference of causation in addition to the inference of ordering: Not only did Jennifer forget to study prior to getting a D, but the addressee also infers that her forgetting to study was the cause of the low grade (and indeed, the fact that the D was received on the algebra test, and not on some other assignment, is a secondary inference based on the inference of causation between the lack of studying and the low grade). These inferences, therefore, cannot be attributed to anything inherent in the word *and* alone; context affects its interpretation. Grice developed a way of addressing such contextual effects on interpretation. What Grice did was to identify a set of rules that interlocutors generally follow, and expect each other to follow, in conversation, and without which conversation would be impossible. These rules, in turn, are themselves various aspects of a single overarching principle, which Grice termed the Cooperative Principle.

2.1 The Cooperative Principle

The basic idea behind the Cooperative Principle (CP) is that interlocutors, above all else, are attempting to be **cooperative** in conversation. Grice's formulation of the CP is rather more detailed:

The Cooperative Principle: Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged. (Grice 1975: 45)

Here, the implicature in each case is made explicit, yet there is no sense of redundancy, because in a very real sense the speaker of *the unicorn is a mythical beast* has not in that clause **said** that her husband didn't see a unicorn, nor has the writer of *most of the mothers were Victorian* said, in that clause, that not all of them were. Thus, the addendum making the implicature explicit evokes no sense of redundancy. For this reason, Sadock (1978) argues that reinforceability is roughly as good a test for conversational implicature as cancellability.

Third, conversational implicatures are **nondetachable**. This means that any way of phrasing the same proposition in the same context will result in the same implicature (with the exception of Manner-based implicatures, of course); the implicature cannot be detached from the proposition. Consider (54):

(54)   The woman at the admittance desk told them that Elner was in the emergency room and she had no information on her condition, but the doctor would meet them in the waiting room and give them a report as soon as he knew something. (Flagg 2007)

In (54), in the context of Elner being in the emergency room, mention of a doctor who would *give them a report as soon as he knew something* gives rise to a Relation-based implicature to the effect that the report will be a report on Elner's condition, and that *as soon as he knew something* means "as soon as he knew something about Elner's condition." Now consider (55):

(55)   The woman at the admittance desk told them that Elner was in the emergency room and she had no information on her condition, but the doctor would meet them in the waiting room and provide a report to them as soon as he had information.

Notice that the last dozen words here differ from those at the end of (54), yet the propositional content is essentially the same – and the implicatures likewise remain the same. In fact, in this context there is no way to convey that the doctor would provide a report (or an update, or information, etc.) as soon as he knew something (or had information, or knowledge, etc.) without implicating that the information and the report would both be about Elner's condition. Any way of conveying the same semantic content will convey this implicature as well. Nonetheless, it is cancellable:

(56)   The woman at the admittance desk told them that Elner was in the emergency room and she had no information on her condition, but the doctor would meet them in the waiting room and give them a report as soon as he knew something – but the report would unfortunately only contain very general information about the tests that would be done. For specific information on Elner's condition, they would have to wait until morning.

intelligent, insightful, and organized, but had stolen a great deal of money from my department. If my letter mentions her intellect, insight, and organization, but fails to mention her dishonesty, I will have violated Quantity by failing to say enough – and because this omission is unlikely to be noticed by the reader (who, after all, has no way of knowing about the dishonesty), the reader will draw no inference and will be misled into believing that Ms. Smith is a suitable candidate for a job.

Consider, for example, the following excerpt, in which the author is describing the label on a carton of "organic" milk:

(27)   This particular dairy's label had a lot to say about the bovine lifestyle: Its Holsteins are provided with "an appropriate environment, including shelter and a comfortable resting area, . . . sufficient space, proper facili-ties and the company of their own kind." All this sounded pretty great, until I read the story of another dairy selling raw milk – *completely* unprocessed – whose "cows graze green pastures all year long." Which made me wonder whether the first dairy's idea of an appropriate environ-ment for a cow included, as I had simply presumed, a pasture. All of a sudden the absence from their story of that word seemed weirdly con-spicuous. As the literary critics would say, the writer seemed to be eliding the whole notion of cows and grass. (Pollan 2006)

Here, the reader comes to suspect that the writer has purposely violated the maxim of Quantity – leaving out any mention of whether the cows are allowed to graze on pastures – in order to leave the reader with the impression that they are. The information would clearly be relevant, but in order to obey the maxim of Quality (by not saying something false), they are forced instead to either admit the absence of pastures in their cows' lives or simply omit this information and thus quietly violate the maxim of Quantity. Most readers of the label would never notice the difference and would thus be misled into assuming the cows have a more pleasant life than they probably do; the reader in (27) notices the omission only in comparison with a label from another brand.

The second submaxim of Quantity is less commonly studied; this submaxim tells us not to say more than is necessary. When the Queen in *Hamlet* says "the lady doth protest too much," this is the submaxim she is implicitly making refer-ence to: The lady in question is violating the maxim of Quantity by "protesting" (in Shakespearean English, vowing or declaring) more than is necessary – that is, by saying too much – and the extent of the protesting suggests to the hearer that the protest is not to be believed. As we will see in the next chapter, many research-ers collapse the second submaxim of Quantity with the maxim of Relation, on the grounds that to say too much is essentially to say what is not relevant, and that conversely to say what is not relevant is to say too much.

The non-truth-conditional status of Quantity implicatures has been supported by no less an authority than the United States Supreme Court, in a perjury case

incorrect or simply too blunt: Consider a situation in which speaker A has asked speaker B, *How does this outfit look on me?* If B thinks A looks great, all is well. However, if B thinks A looks terrible, there are two choices: B can either say so directly (*You look terrible*), or flout brevity (*That's quite an outfit; I'm not sure I've seen you wear that before. The colors are certainly bright, and you've always looked good in bright colors, but then again it's awfully sunny outside and might call for something more muted . . .*). In the latter case, A is likely to make the correct inference ("you look terrible") without the unpleasantness that would likely ensue from the more blunt assertion.

In (37) we see the effect of a failed attempt to quietly violate the brevity submaxim:

(37)   I travelled across country and joined the local train midway, expecting to find Sebastian already established; there he was, however, in the next carriage to mine, and when I asked him what he was doing, Mr Samgrass replied with such glibness and at such length, telling me of mislaid luggage and of Cook's being shut over the holidays, that I was at once aware of some other explanation which was being withheld. (Waugh 1946)

Here, through the length of his reply (along with its glibness), Samgrass unwittingly suggests to the hearer that there is something that he is trying to cover up.

Finally, the fourth submaxim of Manner, "be orderly," is generally taken to mean, among other things, that a narrative will present ordered events in the order in which they happened (unless the author is trying for some particular literary effect). Thus, to say (38a) will implicate (38b):

(38)   a.   His footsteps made the floor creak, and he coughed self-consciously. (Braun 1986)
        b.   He coughed self-consciously after his footsteps made the floor creak.

That is to say, a temporal ordering is imposed on the events described, with the temporal ordering corresponding to the order in which they are presented. It would not be false to utter (38a) in a situation in which the man in question first coughed self-consciously, after which his footsteps made the floor creak, since both of those things did happen. (Which is to say, the implicature is not part of the truth-conditional content of the sentence.) But it would be a distinctly uncooperative way to report them. Recall from the beginning of the chapter that this implicature is not always associated with the use of the conjunction *and*; for example, if I report that I ate bacon and eggs for breakfast, my hearer will not infer that I first ate the bacon and then the eggs. Thus, the implicature is neither truth-conditional nor context-independent. Recall also that temporal ordering is not the only implicature associated with the conjunction; in (38a), for example, there is an additional implicature of causation – that is, an implicature that the

that this is because the questioned aspect of the utterance is outside the NP, note that it's possible for virtually all of the identifying information to be in question:

(94) X: An old man jumped off a bridge this morning.
      Y: No, it wasn't an old man; it was a young woman. And she didn't jump; she was pushed. And it was last night, not this morning.

So you might argue that at least X and Y are in agreement that there is some entity in the world that they are mutually referring to, even if they disagree about most of its properties. But consider (95):

(95) X: An old man jumped off a bridge this morning.
      Y: No, he didn't; it turns out that whole story was completely made up.

Who or what is the referent of *he* in Y's utterance in (95)? It's not the man who jumped off the bridge, and in fact it's not any entity in the world at all. It seems the closest we can come is to say that the referent of *he* is the discourse entity to which X intended to refer – but this isn't quite right either, since clearly X did not mean to say that some mental construct jumped off a bridge. It seems clear that the correct analysis will ultimately need to take something from both mentalism and referentialism, acknowledging the speaker's intention to refer to something outside their own mind (most of the time, anyway) while nonetheless relativizing reference to the speaker's beliefs.

Just as it is difficult to specify precisely what a referent really is, it is difficult to delimit what can and cannot be considered a referring expression. In some cases it is clear:

(96) a. *My brother* lives in Sacramento.
      b. *The dog* needs to go out.
      c. *That* is a great car.

Here, *my brother*, *the dog*, and *that* are clearly referring expressions. But other cases are less clear:

(97) a. *The tiger* is a dangerous creature.
      b. If you can't come, *that* will be a shame.
      c. *Barbara's sincerity* is really touching.
      d. I can't decide *what* to eat.
      e. *Yesterday* was beautiful.
      f. I saw my cousin *yesterday*.
      g. *It's* warm today.
      h. *It's* John who's spreading the rumor.

its definiteness, and which seem absent. If it seems to be licensed by some other factor not discussed in this chapter, develop a hypothesis as to why it is definite.

7. Discuss the differences among the familiarity, uniqueness, and individuability accounts of definiteness, summarizing the strengths and weaknesses of each.

8. Throughout this chapter, the difference between definiteness and indefiniteness was handled via (unsuccessful) attempts to delimit necessary and sufficient conditions for definiteness. Try to formulate, instead, a set of necessary and sufficient conditions for indefiniteness, and discuss the problems you encounter.

9. Find a naturally occurring example corresponding to each of the form/status pairs on Gundel *et al.*'s Givenness Hierarchy. For each example, try to determine whether the use of the form in question implicates that no higher status applies.

10. Ask 20 friends whether, in each of the following contexts, they would use the word *my* or the indefinite article (*a/an*) as the determiner in describing an injury they had suffered:
    a. I broke _____ arm.
    b. I burst _____ blood vessel.
    c. I chipped _____ tooth.
    d. I bumped _____ nose.
    e. I broke _____ finger.
    f. I tore _____ ligament.
    g. I sprained _____ ankle.

    What seems to determine which determiner is used? What happens to the meaning if you swap in the dispreferred option in (d), or in (f)? Why do you suppose that is? (For further discussion, see Horn 1984 and Birner 1988.)

11. Consider the fact that speakers will use the definite article in saying they have *the flu*, *the measles*, or *the chicken pox*, but will use the indefinite article in saying they have *a cold*, *a virus*, or *an injury*. Come up with a hypothesis for why this difference exists.

12. We saw in example (139) that intonation can affect pronoun resolution. Discuss the effect of intonation on truth conditions in this case – not only with respect to reference resolution, but also the interpretation of what is and is not an insult. Does this pose a problem for truth-conditional semantics? If so, what is the problem? If not, why not?

13. In the text, it was noted that the final *this* in (145b) could reasonably be taken as either deictic or anaphoric. Argue for one position or the other.

14. Construct two scenarios – one in which the phrase *the best student in the class* is used referentially, and one in which it is used attributively. Discuss the difference between the two cases.

15. Linguists distinguish between **specific** and **nonspecific** uses of indefinite NPs, as illustrated below:
    - (i) a. Leah wants to marry a Swede, but she doesn't know any.
         b. Leah wants to marry a Swede, but her parents don't like him.
    - (ii) a. Frank talked to a doctor this morning

    In (ia), the NP *a Swede* is used nonspecifically – that is, there isn't any particular Swede the speaker has in mind. In (ib) this NP is used specifically – that is, in reference to a particular Swede. Similarly, (ii) could mean that Frank talked to a specific doctor, or simply that he had a medical consultation – that is, that *a doctor* describes the type of person he talked to. Compare this distinction for indefinite NPs with the referential/attributive distinction for definite NPs. Do Donnellan's tests apply in the same way? Notice that even in the nonspecific cases, an anaphoric pronoun can have the NP as its antecedent:
    - (iii) Leah wants to marry a Swede, and he has to be both rich and handsome.

    Does the nonspecific use involve a discourse-model referent? Discuss any other ramifications of your findings for the representation of referents in the discourse model.

If we take a pragmatic view of presuppositions as background information, one way to look at an utterance is to distinguish between the backgrounded, presupposed portion and the new, informative portion. This approach divides the information encoded by an utterance into a **presupposition** and **focus**. This division is very easy to see in the case of clefts. Consider the examples of clefts in (169), repeated here along with, for each, the cleft in question, its presupposition, and its focus:

(193) a. He remarked that *it was his mother who taught him how to dress*, which reminded him of how the Fiat magnate Gianni Agnelli had provided him with a bespoke wardrobe – which reminded him that while he was in Rome filming "The Victors," in 1963, he'd arranged to meet the world's most beautiful woman, the actress Jocelyn Lane, in front of the Trevi Fountain.
Cleft: *It was his mother who taught him how to dress.*
Presupposition: Someone taught him how to dress
Focus: his mother
       b. Rowley had one of her first fashion shows in the eighties on the deck of a boat on the Chicago River. "It was a disaster," she said of the pirate-themed event. "The changing room blew overboard, the models were seasick, and the guests got drunker and drunker. But you could get away with things like that in Chicago. The community supports you. *That's what gave me the courage and confidence to go to New York*, where I knew I would have my ass whipped."
Cleft: *That's what gave me the courage and confidence to go to New York.*
Presupposition: Something gave me the courage and confidence to go to New York
Focus: that

In (193a) the focus *his mother* indicates that "his mother" is the "someone" who taught him how to dress; similarly, in (193b), *that* provides the "something" that "gave me the courage and confidence to go to New York." Since *that* is anaphoric, the prior linguistic context provides its referent – that is, what it is that gave the speaker the courage and confidence to go to New York (specifically, the community support that she had found in Chicago).

Clefts are among a number of expressions that are felicitous only if an appropriate proposition is presupposed in the context. This means that (193a) will only be felicitous in a context in which it is presupposed that someone taught him how to dress, and (193b) will only be felicitous in a context in which it is presupposed that something gave the speaker the courage and confidence to go to New York.

considered the necessary relationship between theories of presupposition and theories of definiteness.

5.8 Exercises and Discussion Questions

1. Photocopy a paragraph of 10 lines or more from any book you wish, and underline each expression that seems presuppositional. On a separate sheet, list the presuppositions and test them for constancy under negation.

2. Use a truth table to show that if Russell is right in his characterization of presupposition (given in (157)), then he is also right that the falsity of the presupposition entails the falsity of the entire utterance.

3. Find six examples of presupposition in advertisements. Describe and explain each example, showing how it contributes to the goals of the advertiser.

4. Consider the following examples:
   (i) The soup has thawed.
   (ii) The soup has not thawed.
   (iii) The soup has not thawed; it was never frozen!
   (iv) The soup has thawed, if it was ever frozen.
   Give the two presuppositions found in (i), and for each of the examples in (ii)–(iv), explain what effect (if any) the modification has on what is presupposed, using the terms and concepts from this chapter.

5. Abbott (2006) offers the following example to illustrate the difference between presupposition and conventional implicature:
   (i) Even the King of France is bald. (Abbott 2006, example 12)
   This is true if there's a King of France and he's bald, regardless of whether or not he's the least likely person to be bald. However, it cannot be true if there's no King of France. Explain how these two facts distinguish what is presupposed in (i) from what is conventionally implicated.

6. Conduct a web search to create a corpus of 50 naturally occurring instances of presupposition, including 10 of each of the five types of presupposition trigger described in the text.

7. Iteratives (e.g., *again*) are treated here and in much of the pragmatics literature as presuppositional, in that *Zizi brought the basin again* and *Zizi did not bring the basin again* both seem to assume that Zizi brought the

basin previously. Others, however, have argued that this is a conventional implicature, not a presupposition. On what sort of evidence would the difference depend? How would you argue for one view over the other?

8. Presuppositions are easiest to deal with when the utterance under discussion is a declarative. What would Russell and Strawson say about an example such as (i)?
    (i) Has Harriet stopped smoking?
    How, in turn, might a pragmatic account deal with such an utterance?

9. We observed with respect to (182a), repeated below, that it's possible to suspend a presupposition:
    (i) John has stopped smoking, if he ever did smoke. (= (182a))
    Explain why this mechanism appears to be available in cases like (i) but unavailable in cases like (ii):
    (ii) #I realize that I broke the vase, if in fact I did.
    Try to formulate a rule that will distinguish between these two categories of attempted suspensions.

10. The following sentence contains a presuppositional expression:
    (i) Charlie regrets that he is tall.
    Tell which category of presupposition trigger is involved here, and list five more members of this category other than those presented in the text.

11. Find eight examples of accommodation in written material. For each, explain what is being presupposed and why the reader is willing to accommodate the presupposition.

12. Recall Donnellan's argument (from Chapter 4) that on the attributive reading, if nobody murdered Smith, the utterance *Smith's murderer is insane* cannot be true. Relate this to the claim that if there is no King of France, the utterance *The King of France is wise* cannot be true. Does this mean that the difference between Donnellan's referential and attributive categories boils down to the difference between NPs that are and are not presupposed? Support your answer.

85

Each of the examples in (213) has the characteristic performative form described above (first-person pronoun subject, present-tense verb describing the action being performed), and also passes the *hereby* test (although in (213d), the *hereby* would sound best if *now* were removed, to avoid redundancy).

However, there are other utterances that are used to perform an act – often the same act performed by their performative counterpart – but do not take the form of a performative. For example, consider again the request and command in (207):

(214) a. Keep trying to get his office.
       b. Sit down!

In each of these instances, the speaker performs the same act as if the corresponding performative utterance had been used:

(215) a. I request that you keep trying to get his office.
       b. I command you to sit down!

Each of the sentences in (215) is a performative; each is a declarative sentence in the present tense, with a first-person singular subject and a present-tense verb that describes the act (requesting, commanding) that is being performed by means of the uttering of the sentence, and each passes the *hereby* test:

(216) a. I hereby request that you keep trying to get his office.
       b. I hereby command you to sit down!

The examples in (214), on the other hand, are not, strictly speaking, performatives in this sense. They do not have a first-person subject, they are not declarative, the verb does not describe the act being performed by the utterance (i.e., uttering *sit down* is not the same as sitting down), and they do not pass the *hereby* test:

(217) a. #Hereby keep trying to get his office.
       b. #Hereby sit down!

Nonetheless, each of the utterances in (214) is used to perform an act of requesting or commanding. Similar instances of utterances being used to perform acts are given in (218):

(218) a. "Dagny," said Hugh Akston, "I'm sorry." He spoke softly, with effort, as if his words were struggling and failing to fill the silence of the room.
       b. "I'll deliver the Metal. When you need the other half of your order, let me know. I'll deliver that, too."

In (222a), *myself* is acceptable in the context of the earlier *I*. However, in (222b), *herself* has no appropriate antecedent, and the clause is ungrammatical. (Whether this is actual ungrammaticality or merely pragmatic infelicity is a question we'll set aside for now. Syntacticians take it to be ungrammatical, and have used this fact in developing rather complex syntactic theories concerning the use of reflexives.) Importantly, this is not merely a matter of unclarity regarding the antecedent: While *herself* is fine with an earlier mention of a third-person female (*Claire*) in (222c), an earlier mention of Claire in (222d) does not rescue the reflexive, despite the fact that the context makes it perfectly clear who the intended antecedent of *herself* is. Now consider (223):

(223)   a.   The party is being planned by Karl and myself.
        b.   People like yourself should never learn to drive.
        c.   Behave yourself!

Here, the reflexives *myself* and *yourself* are acceptable, despite the absence of an antecedent. However, according to the Performative Hypothesis, the underlying structure for each would be something like:

(224)   a.   I tell you that the party is being planned by Karl and myself.
        b.   I tell you that people like yourself should never learn to drive.
        c.   I command you to behave yourself!

If the hypothesis is correct, the presence of *I* and *you* in the underlying performative would provide antecedents for the reflexives. Moreover, it would explain the use of sentence-initial adverbs like *frankly* and *hopefully*:

(225)   a.   Frankly, this is a terrible movie.
        b.   Hopefully it won't snow tomorrow.

According to the Performative Hypothesis, these have as their underlying structure the performatives in (226):

(226)   a.   I tell you frankly that this is a terrible movie.
        b.   I tell you hopefully that it won't snow tomorrow.

In addition, under this account, all sentences – including questions, commands, apologies, and so on – have truth conditions. For example, whereas it's difficult to say what the truth conditions of (223c) might be, under the Performative Hypothesis it's quite easy to say what the truth conditions of (224c) would be; it's true if and only if I am in fact commanding you to behave yourself.

The Performative Hypothesis ran into trouble, however, in light of the fact that the putative underlying and surface variants don't have the same truth conditions. Consider the pairs in (227)–(228):

performative? Second, which of Austin's felicity conditions does this act violate, and why?

4. How do Searle's rules for promising map onto Austin's felicity conditions for a speech act? Where do they correspond? Where do they differ?

5. Select a type of speech act and spell out the propositional-content, preparatory, sincerity, and essential rules for that act, as Searle has done for promises.

6. Discuss bequests in terms of speech act theory. What form do they typically take? What does the *hereby* test tell you? What are their felicity conditions? (If you're not familiar with bequests, you may need to do a bit of web research.)

7. How does the violation of one of Searle's felicity conditions correspond to the violation of a maxim of the Cooperative Principle? Give examples.

8. The text discusses the difficulties involved in, for example, the US Senate's apology for slavery, and Bill Clinton's apology for the Monica Lewinsky affair. Find and discuss a naturally occurring example of a different type of speech act in which a perceived failure to satisfy one or more felicity conditions interfered with the perlocutionary effect of the act.

9. Explain, with examples, how the four maxims of the Cooperative Principle can guide a hearer in discovering the intended illocutionary force behind an indirect speech act.

10. Find a naturally occurring example of an indirect speech act and show, step by step, how it is calculable via shared knowledge, Grice's maxims, and general principles of rationality. Use Searle's example in (246) as a model.

11. Choose a type of speech act other than an offer or a request and show how the satisfaction of each of its felicity conditions can be either asserted or questioned as a way of performing that speech act indirectly. Discuss any difficulties you encounter.

12. The text points out the following canonical correlations of form and illocutionary force:
    declarative – statement
    interrogative – question
    imperative – command

244   *Inferential Relations*

are treated alike with respect to their placement in noncanonical constructions. Chapter 7 included many examples of inferrability licensing preposing and inversion, including the following:

(319) a. She put the cameo inside a sock and put the sock in her purse. She would sell it, and *with the money she would buy a new and fashionable suit.* (= (291a))

   b. Every time I used one, I found myself longing for the good old days, when computers just did what you told them to, and nothing more. Unfortunately, that wasn't the way it was any longer. These days, when you asked a computer for anything, you were lucky if it did what you wanted at all.

   Computers had names now, too. Mine was called Aaron. Aaron wasn't as belligerent as most of his counterparts, but *helpful he wasn't either.* (= (291c))

   c. His face, which carried the entire tale of his years, was of the brown tint of Dublin streets. *On his long and rather large head grew dry black hair* and a tawny moustache did not quite cover an unamiable mouth. (= (300b))

   d. Outside the trade field, a similar readiness to forego the benefits of strict reciprocity could be seen in the unprecedented generosity of the Marshall Aid programme. *Even more surprising was the American attitude to non-discrimination.* (= (300c))

In (319a), there is no explicit prior mention of money; however, intuitively we recognize that there is an inferential relationship between money and the prior mention of selling something: Once the author has mentioned a character planning to sell something, the inferrable money that will result from the sale counts as discourse-old – and because it counts as discourse-old, it can be preposed. The fact that it can be preposed counts as strong evidence of its discourse-old status, since discourse-new information cannot be preposed:

(320) She put the cameo inside a sock and put the sock in her purse. She would sell it, and #*with a pen she would note how much she received for it.*

Here the pen is not inferrable, and the preposing is infelicitous. Note, however, that there is a second problem here, which is that there's no appropriate OP to license the preposing. So on the face of it, we can't tell whether the infelicity is due to the lack of inferrability (rendering the preposed constituent discourse-new) or the lack of an OP.

It is, however, quite difficult to come up with a context in which the OP is present but there's no inferential relationship between the preposed constituent and the prior discourse, unless you make the preposed constituent something that also has no apparent relationship to the rest of its sentence:

89

- scalar relations
- encyclopedic relations

These relations are illustrated in (335a–l), respectively:

(335) a. She's *a nice woman,* isn't she? Also *a nice woman* is our next guest . . . (David Letterman, May 31, 1990) → **Lexical identity**

b. *Jeffrey Keith Skilling,* former president of Enron Corp., has been quietly serving a 24-year sentence at a federal prison in Colorado. The misdoings of *the convicted architect of America's biggest corporate bankruptcy* have faded from the front pages . . . (= (323)) → **Referential identity**

c. Two things perhaps would especially catch the eye on the Cheshire shore; the *enticing* entrance of that long natural inlet, the Great Float, curving round the low rocky hill of Wallasey; and the lighthouse and signal masts of Bidston Hill, rising above the trees. Equally *attractive* was the Lancashire shore; a long line of sandy beach, backed by sandhills, extended from the mouth of the river to within a mile of St. Nicholas' Church. (Young and Young 1913) → **Synonymy**

d. He gripped the railing with his left hand and held the flashlight rigid before him as he climbed the staircase. The light only made the surrounding darkness more hideous. *Below* him, when he was half-way up, a well of frightful gloom lay waiting. *Above* him was the singsong of the wind outside the house, and the creak of wooden floors inside. (Cave 2004) → **Antonymy**

e. It was *a kitchen,* lived in but neat. The semidarkness of the evening was cut only by the light filtering back from the lamps on the street, turning the interior into shades of gray. Everything one would expect to be there was – refrigerator, dishwasher, sink. On *the counter* were several cookbooks, a toaster, a ceramic jar full of utensils, and a blender, all ready and waiting. (= (326b)) → **Part/whole**

f. From the moment we met this morning, *he* had pulled one obnoxious, bigoted, sexist thing after another. *Brilliant* he wasn't, but dogged and arrogant he was, and he would be capable of making my life miserable if I wasn't very careful. (Francis 2003) → **Entity/attribute**

g. The month of May was an exceptionally cool one, and his secret prayers were granted; but *early in June* there came a record-breaking hot spell, and *after that* there were men wanted in the fertilizer mill. (Sinclair 1906) → **Temporal ordering**

h. The piano was playing a waltz tune and he could hear the skirts sweeping against the drawing-room door. People, perhaps, were standing in the snow on the quay outside, gazing up at the lighted windows and listening to the waltz music. The air was pure *there. In the distance* lay the park where the trees were weighted with snow. (= (326c)) → **Spatial relations**

may include information from the previous DRS; that is to say, each sentence added to the discourse will produce a new DRS that builds upon the information in the previous DRS rather than starting anew. Thus, consider the DRS that results from adding the second sentence of the discourse:

(374)   A slave named Androcles once escaped from his master and fled to the forest. As he was wandering about there he came upon a Lion lying down moaning and groaning. (= (368))

(375)

$$
\begin{array}{|l|}
\hline
x\ y\ z\ u\ v \\
\text{slave}\ (x) \\
\text{Androcles}\ (x) \\
\text{master-of}\ (y,x) \\
\text{forest}\ (z) \\
\text{escaped-from}\ (x,y) \\
\text{fled-to}\ (x,z) \\
u = x \\
\text{wandering-about}\ (u) \\
\text{lion}\ (v) \\
\text{came-upon}\ (u,v) \\
\text{lying-down}\ (v) \\
\text{moaning}\ (v) \\
\text{groaning}\ (v) \\
\hline
\end{array}
$$

(We will continue to ignore issues of tense and aspect.) This DRS retains all of the information from the previous DRS, but adds two new referents. The first, the referent of *he*, is represented by u (since we've run out of end-of-the-alphabet letters), and equated with x. This is how DRT indicates the coreference of *a slave* in the first sentence and *he* in the second. It wouldn't do to simply continue to use x for the second sentence, since it would eliminate the crucial detail that the pronoun doesn't in fact have to be coreferential with the slave evoked in the first sentence. One could imagine the following discourse:

(376)   A slave named Androcles once escaped from his master and fled to the forest. As he was prowling that same area of the forest, a lion heard Androcles crashing through the underbrush.

Here, *he* in the second sentence takes the lion as its referent, despite the fact that the discourse up to the point of its utterance is identical to that in (374). In short, coreference (as we've observed before) is something that must be established contextually, and hence must be explicitly noted in the DRS rather than taken as a given.

affects what it means for an utterance to be true, and thereby the nature of semantics (to the extent that semantics has to do with truth and falsity); in particular, the meaning of a sentence is its context change potential, and the question of its truth is in essence a question of whether the difference between one DRS and another maps onto what is the case in a given world. This shift in the meaning of a sentence – from being defined in terms of only that sentence to being defined in terms of a difference between the discourse record's status prior to that sentence and its status upon the addition of that sentence – corresponds to an inclusion of pragmatic material in the semantics of the discourse and a simultaneous inclusion of semantic material in the pragmatics of the discourse. Nonetheless, there remain aspects of utterance interpretation that are essentially and inescapably pragmatic, by anyone's definition – aspects of meaning that require inferences based on world knowledge, broadly construed, and which cannot be reduced to a set of syntactic or semantic rules. Although dynamic semantics offers an intriguing avenue for considering the contribution of semantic and pragmatic material to each other's interpretative domains, there remain aspects of linguistic meaning that are quintessentially semantic, and others that are quintessentially pragmatic.

9.6 Exercises and Discussion Questions

1. Provide a DRS for each of the following.
   a. Mary failed the exam.
   b. Spaghetti is delicious.
   c. *Syntactic Structures* is interesting.
   d. Every student read *Syntactic Structures*.
   e. If a boy eats spaghetti, he is happy.

2. Provide a DRS for each of the following. Discuss any difficulties you encounter.
   a. A student failed the exam.
   b. My favorite student failed the exam.
   c. Spaghetti tastes better than broccoli.
   d. *Syntactic Structures* is an interesting book.
   e. Ketchup is an unlikely vegetable.

3. Provide a sequence of DRSs for the following small discourse:
   A young girl went to the store. She looked for broccoli, but the store had none. Disappointed, she bought spaghetti. She took it home and cooked it – and was surprised: It was delicious!

RESUME

Name Surname: Nadhim Najmalddin
Place and Date of Birth: 25/Nov/1983
E-Mail: nazimothman@gmail.com

EDUCATION:

- **Bachelor:** 2006, Sulaimanyah University, College of Languages, English language and literature

- **Master:** 2016, Istanbul Aydin University, English language and literature, English language and literature program

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE AND REWARDS
PUBLICATIONS/PRESENTATIONS ON THE THESIS:

- I have been teaching EFL classes as an instructor in a several high schools and language institutions since 2007 up to date.

- Najmalddin, N., (2016). Raising Pragmatic Competence in Foreign Language Classrooms MA thesis, Istanbul Aydin University.