Language Learners' Feelings about Pragmatics in Action

Ümran ÜSTÜNBAŞ[1]

[1] Instructor, School of Foreign Languages, Bülent Ecevit University, Turkey,
uustunbas@beun.edu.tr

Abstract: This paper presents the findings of a quasi-experimental study designed to examine the possible effect of explicit or implicit teaching of pragmatic routines regarding the significance of exploring ways to foster interlanguage pragmatic competence considering the fact that language learners, at least, could benefit the real-life language use presented them since they do not have many opportunities to communicate in the target language. In sense, 134 tertiary level EFL learners were recruited as participants in treatment and control groups and taught predetermined target routines appropriately for their assigned groups. Following a five-week treatment session, a post-test was administered to the participants in order to evaluate the effect of the treatment on comprehension, and their spoken discourse was analyzed to detect the effect of the treatment on production. Qualitative data of the study were comprised of participants' reflections based on the use of metaphors related to the pragmatic routines and their effects. Thus, the study provides findings to review a highly discussed issue in applied linguistics and offers further data employing an elaborate research method: using metaphors.

Yabancı Dil Öğrencilerinin Günlük İfadelerin Kullanımı Konusunda Görüsleri
Öz: Bu çalışma, İngilizce'de kullanılan günlün ifadelerin öğrencilere doğrudan ya da dolaylı öğretiminin olası etkisini araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Yarı deneysel özelliklere sahip çalışmanın dayanağı, ikinci yabancı dili kullanma imkanı sınıf dışında sınırlı olan öğrencilere günlük ifadelerin kullanımını öğretmenin yarar sağlayabileceği düşüncesidir. Bu amaçla, yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğrenen 134 öğrenci çalışmanın katılımcıları olarak belirlenmiş ve çalışmanın araştırma konusuna uygun olarak deney ve kontrol grupları olarak ayrılmışlardır. Beş haftalık bir sürecin sonunda, eğitimin öğrencilerin ifadelerin kullanımı kavramalarında etkili olup olmadığını anlamak amacıyla bir son test uygulanmıştır. Dahası, öğrencilerin ifade üretimini incelemek için sınıf içi etkinlikleri kayıt altına alınmıştır. Çalışmanın nitel verisini, günlük ifadelere ve etkilerine dair öğrencilerin düşüncelerinin mecaz kullanımı yoluyla alınması oluşturmaktadır. Çalışmanın verileri, günlük ifadeleri doğrudan öğretmenin daha etkili olduğunu ve öğrencilerin bu öğrenme deneyimine kapsamlı mecazlar kullanarak olumlu tepkiler verdiğini ortaya koymaktadır. Böylece çalışma, ikinci yabancı dil öğretimi alanında son zamanlarda sıklıkla konuşulan bir konuya ışık tutmayı ve kapsamlı bir veri toplama aracı olan mecaz kullanımıyla var olan kavramsal dayanağa katkı sağlamayı hedeflemektedir.

1. Introduction

The importance of learners' interaction and communication has increased with Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), triggering attempts to create opportunities for learners' exposure to real language use, which is also the focus of pragmatics. There has been continuous interest in the integration of pragmatics into language teaching. With respect to this, pragmatic routines have been investigated from various angles, one of which is the effect of teaching them explicitly or implicitly (e.g., Fukuya & Zhang, 2002; House, 1996; Roever, 2012; Takahashi, 2001), and it seems beneficial to support the existing research with new findings. Therefore, this paper presents a study designed to examine the possible effect of explicit and implicit teaching of pragmatic routines. The paper also provides qualitative data through the use of metaphors pertaining to how language learners feel about being taught the pragmatic routines, which promotes learners' higher ranking cognitive skills.

2. Review of Literature
2.1. Pragmatic competence as an essential aspect of interlanguage

Previous research on interlanguage development of learners has suggested that the speaking skill is regarded as the most difficult and important language skill (Ur, 1996), and it also causes language anxiety (e.g., Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986; Shumin, 2002). One of the reasons for this difficulty is that learners are required to know how language is used in social communication, and this fact underlines the significance of social factors in human spoken interaction. Considering the significant effect of socio-cultural factors in language, researchers have discussed whether pragmatics, which is defined as "the study of communicative action in its socio-cultural context" (Kasper & Rose, 2001, p. 2) or "the study of people's comprehension and production of linguistic action in context" (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993, p. 3), can be taught in language classes (e.g., Kasper, 1997; Jeon & Kaya, 2006; Kasper & Rose, 2001; 2002; Rose, 2005). More specifically, researchers have discussed whether both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic features of pragmatic competence can be effectively acquired. Kasper (1997) has stated that pragmatic competence cannot be taught since it refers to learners' existing knowledge. However, instructional methods such as noticing activities can be employed to develop both this knowledge and production. Considering the importance of pragmatic instruction, Kasper and Rose (2001) have also highlighted that linguistics and social aspects of pragmatics cannot be made clear without instruction. Similarly, Rose (2005) has concluded that a number of pragmatic elements such as speech acts, pragmatic routines and discourse markers can be taught through instruction. Furthermore, Roever (2012) has proposed that EFL learners who have no opportunities to be in the target language setting are still likely to learn pragmatic routines through exposure to the language in appropriate contexts even though their choice of what aspects to be used is mostly determined by the degree of communication in the target language. In this sense, Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993) have indicated that "one area where insufficient control of pragmalinguistic knowledge is particularly obvious is that of pragmatic routines" (p. 9) which is defined as "social conventions which form part of a speaker's pragmalinguistic competence" (Bardovi-Harlig, Mossman &Vellenga, 2015, p. 500). Thus, one of the aims of the current study is to investigate whether teaching these routines is effective on language learners' pragmatic knowledge and production.

2.2. Explicit/implicit teaching of pragmatic routines

Besides the discussion on whether to teach pragmatics to language learners, there is another discussion on which instruction type (explicit or implicit) is more effective in teaching it. In general, previous research tends to favor explicit teaching of pragmatics over implicit (e.g., Fukuya & Zhang, 2002; House, 1996; Takahashi, 2001; Tateyama, Kasper, Mui, Tay, &

Thananart, 1997). Other studies have examined the effect of explicit instruction using awareness activities and suggested that explicit instruction of pragmatics is more effective with these activity types (e.g., House, 1996; Takahashi, 2001; Martínez-Flor & Fukuya, 2005). For example, in a study carried out with high-intermediate level learners studying for academic purposes, Bardovi-Harlig et al. (2015) have revealed that awareness raising activities and explicit instruction are highly effective in improving pragmatic competence. Likewise, Bardovi-Harlig and Griffin (2005) have emphasized the significance of pragmatic awareness activities in an ESL context in the results of a study conducted with 43 ESL learners. Moreover, Koike and Pearson (2005) have investigated the value of teaching pragmatics through various types of pre-instructional activities. They revealed that the explicit pre-instruction and feedback group had more benefits from this treatment than other groups in multiple-choice items whereas the implicit instruction and feedback group was better in open-ended dialogs. Similar findings have been set forth by Nguyen, Pham and Pham (2012) in that explicit pragmatic instruction accompanied by awareness activities had a positive effect on L2 learners' pragmatic competence; however, since the number of the studies on the effect of implicit instruction is limited, more research needs to be put forward to support the findings. Therefore, the current study aims to provide support for the discussion on the use of explicit and implicit instruction and to review the findings that show speaking as the most difficult language skill for learners. Furthermore, there is no evidence of language learners' views about teaching of pragmatics through routines. Taking this gap and other issues into consideration, this study addresses the following research questions.

3. Research questions
This study tried to find answers to the following questions:
1. Which language skill/sub-skill needs to be improved urgently?
2. Does teaching of pragmatic routines (explicitly/implicitly) have an effect on language learners' pragmatic competence and spoken production?
3. How do language learners feel about being taught the pragmatic routines?

4. Study
4.1. Setting and Participants
In order to address the research questions, 134 learners from the tertiary level in an EFL setting were recruited as the participants of the study. Specifically, they were language learners who study at a state university in Turkey in their first year. These students take a proficiency exam in English at the beginning of the academic year, and the ones who obtain 60% or higher pass the exam and carry on their studies in their own departments, while the ones who fail are obliged to take a one-academic year language education at the School of Foreign Languages of the university since the university's language of instruction is between the ranges of 30% to 100% English. The students who fail the English proficiency exam learn English in classes appropriate for their language levels ranging from A1 to B1 according to CEFR descriptions and take 26 hours of intensive language education a week through main course and speaking classes. The participants of the current study are comprised of 134 A2 level language learners at the school. Even though the learners are provided with opportunities to improve their language skills, these opportunities are limited because of the low possibility of interaction with native English speakers. According to observations of the researcher, L2 learners' spoken discourse also lacks idiomaticity as a result of not being exposed to real language use except for in the lessons. They also have high levels of speaking anxiety. Furthermore, the course book used at the school does not include many pragmatic routines. The needs analysis conducted at the school confirmed that these learners welcome any kind of new methods and approaches related to improving their speaking skills. Thus,

they were selected as the participants of the study on a voluntary basis after acquiring permission from the administration and the ethical committee of the institution to conduct the study.

4.2. Data collection
After obtaining the essential permission, the first step of the data collection procedure was to ground the assumption that the speaking skill is the most problematic skill for the learner. For this purpose, a questionnaire was administered to the participants, and they ranked the language skills according to the need for improvement from highest to lowest. As the second step, another questionnaire based on Brown's (2007) principles was conducted to determine the sub-skills of speaking which need improvement according to participants. The questionnaire included items such as *pragmatic routines*, *grammatical forms*, *speaking strategies*, *fluency/pronunciation*, *nonverbal communication tools*, and *pragmatic competence*.

As for the pragmatic aspects of the study, a target vocabulary and pragmatic function scale was created in light of A2 level CEFR descriptors (See appendices A and B). The pragmatic routines in the course book were not included in the target vocabulary. Following the creation of the list, the participants were administered a pre-test using the Vocabulary Knowledge Scale (VKS) (See appendix C) which was adapted from Wesche and Paribakht (1996). Another task was a matching activity in which the participants were instructed to match pragmatic expressions with their functions such as *Well…*and *taking time to think*. The purpose of this activity was to analyze the degree to which participants were aware of the pragmatic routines, and the functions they fulfill. Having conducted the pre-tests, learners were divided into three groups: a) the group who received explicit instruction on pragmatic routines; b) the group who received implicit instruction on pragmatic routines, and c) the control group. Treatment groups were taught pragmatic routines for five weeks according to the method assigned to their groups. For the teaching of these routines, lessons plans and materials were designed by the researcher. To this end, explicit and implicit teaching procedures were followed. For the explicit teaching group, first, expressions used for a specific function assigned for the week were presented with their meanings. Then students were presented with a real life context in which they could see how these expressions are used. Following a comprehension check of the context, the learners were presented with mechanical exercises of the expressions. For the last step, the learners chose some of the phrases that they had been presented in order to produce their own situations. Unlike the explicit teaching group, the implicit teaching group was not presented the meanings and functions of the expressions in the first step. Instead they started with a fill-in-the blanks exercise in which the target expressions were presented to raise awareness for the target expressions. Following a number of comprehension exercises, learners were presented with the same mechanical exercise as the explicit group. The production stage was the same for both teaching groups. For both the groups taught explicitly and implicitly, materials were designed to provide learners with opportunities to raise their awareness of the selected phrases; then learners practiced and produced the language they were presented by creating dialogs including new language forms (See, Appendix D for a sample). Furthermore, prior to presenting new phrases, participants revised each week's phrases by using them in appropriate contexts that they had created. On the other hand, the control group had no classroom activities, educational opportunities or target pragmatic routines practice. Yet, they were included in pre- and post- vocabulary tests in consideration of the possibility that they could learn the phrases out of class. Since they were not taught expressions in class, it made it

possible to compare groups in terms of analyzing whether instruction proved beneficial. The phases of the study design were as follows:

Table 1
The design of the study

Week 1
Defining the areas of need for the treatment
Pre-test of related vocabulary and determining the target word list
Week 2
Treatment with explicit and implicit teaching groups (reacting to news)
Week 3
Treatment with explicit and implicit teaching groups (taking time to think and correct things you say)
Week 4
Treatment with explicit and implicit teaching groups (vague expressions and responses)
Week 5
Treatment with explicit and implicit teaching groups (showing agreement)
Week 6
Treatment with explicit and implicit teaching groups (dealing with interruptions)
Week 7
Post-test of related vocabulary and determining the target word list

Besides the analysis of the possible effect of the treatment process on the participants' pragmatic knowledge, its possible effect on spoken production was also analyzed by administering the participants a conversation task and recording their performances. Therefore, it was examined whether learners could notice the use of pragmatic routines and apply them to their spoken discourse. All analyses were conducted with SPSS version 20.

As well as the quantitative data, the effect of the instruction on pragmatic knowledge and production was also investigated qualitatively through the participants' reflections on the treatment process. In this sense, they were asked to reflect on the learning experience by answering a number of questions one of which aimed to encourage participants to think critically by asking them to create a metaphor for the benefits of pragmatic routines. The findings of data collection procedures are as follows:

5. Findings and Discussion
5.1. The language skill and its sub-skills to improve
In order to address the needs of language learners related to language skills they desire to improve, a questionnaire was administered to the participants, and they ordered the language skills according to their perceived need for improvement. As a result of the analyses, it was found that EFL learners see their primary area of need for improvement as speaking (N=72), followed by vocabulary knowledge (N=42), grammar (N=13), listening (N=5), and writing (N=1). That speaking was considered as the skill that needs to be improved urgently was in line with previous research that has emphasized the significance and difficulty of speaking for EFL learners. For instance, Ur (1996) has stated that speaking seems to be the most important language skill according to EFL learners. Others have suggested that because of how it is regarded by language learners, it also causes language anxiety (e.g., Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986; Shumin, 2002). The reason for the difficulty of speaking has been proposed to be socio-cultural factors. Therefore, findings that pragmatic routines, a sub-skill of speaking, require improvement could be attributed to this suggestion. The findings revealed that 64 out of 134 participants consider pragmatic routines as the sub-skill having the utmost

significance. Pragmatic routines were followed by grammatical forms (*N*=23), fluency/pronunciation (*N*=16), pragmatic competence (*N*=13) and nonverbal communication tools (*N*=8). The need for learning pragmatic routines may shed light on the discussion of the possibility of teaching pragmatic competence in class. Previously, a number of researchers suggested that pragmatics cannot be taught as this competence is related to learners' pre-existing knowledge, but they could be noticed through instruction (e.g., Kasper, 1997; Kasper & Rose, 2001). For instance, Rose (2005) has proposed that particular elements of pragmatics, such as pragmatic routines may be taught through instruction. Regarding teachability of pragmatic routines, Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993) have indicated that "one area where insufficient control of pragmalinguistic knowledge is particularly obvious is that of pragmatic routines" (p. 9). Similarly, Roever (2012) has proposed that even though EFL learners have few opportunities to acquire target language in its natural setting, they could still learn some aspects of pragmatic routines in appropriate contexts through increased exposure in classes. Considering what has been suggested in the literature so far and the needs of the participants of the current study who are a sample for all EFL learners, it might be suggested that teaching pragmatic routines be part of language programs in order to enable language learners at least to notice the target language of which they are deprived in their daily lives.

5.2. The effect of teaching pragmatic routines on learners' pragmatic competence and spoken production

The second research question addressed whether pragmatic instruction (explicitly/implicitly) has any effect on learners' pragmatic competence and spoken production. For this purpose, the participants involved in a five-week treatment session in treatment groups (*N*= 38 for explicit teaching; *N*= 35 for implicit teaching, and a control group with *N*=35). Thus, 108 of the initial 134 students participated in the treatment as reluctant students were excluded from the study after the needs analyses for language skill and sub-skills were carried out. Following the pooling of the treatment participants, these 108 students were administered a pre-test including the target pragmatic routines determined by CEFR descriptors for speaking and vocabulary of Waystage (A2) level. After the treatment session, a post test was administered so as to examine the effect of the treatment. Having evaluated the distribution and significance of the related variables, the scores belonging to each test were compared for both groups (treatment and control) by conducting the Mann-Whitney U test, a nonparametric T-test, and one of the variables (groups, *M*=1.32, *SE*=.45) had a relatively significant value with a skewness of .762 (*SE*=.23) and kurtosis of -1.44 (*SE*=.46). The test of Kolmogorov-Smirnov also confirmed this non-normal distribution. (*p*=.000). The output of the Mann-Whitney U test revealed that while there was no statistically significant difference between treatment and control groups in the pre-test (*U*=1188.5, *p*=.55) which had a small effect size according to Cohen's *d* (1988), there was a statistically significant difference between treatment and control groups in the post- test (*U*=103.5, *p*=.000) which had a large effect size (*d*=0.7). This result indicates the positive effect of the treatment session on the participants' pragmatic competence. In order to support this finding with more evidence of learning, another analysis was carried out in which the participants were asked to categorize pragmatic routines according to their functions in pre-and post-tests. Therefore, the scores of these tests belonging to treatment and control groups were compared through the Mann Whitney U test as post-test scores (*M*=10.1, *SE*=.56) had significant values with skewness of 1.12 (*SE*= .23) and kurtosis of 1.27 (SE=.46). Kolmogorov-Smirnov test also confirmed this non-normal distribution (p=.000). As a result of the comparison, it emerged that while there was no significant difference between the two groups in the pre-test (*U*=1153.5, *p*< .05, *d*=0.0), there was a significant difference in the post test (*U*= 726, *p*=.000) with a medium effect size (*d*=0.3) (Cohen, 1988). Thus, this finding supports the previous one with more evidence.

As the results of the analyses on the treatment implied an effect, another analysis was carried out in order to explore whether there is any difference between explicit and implicit groups during the treatment session, thereby detecting the effect of the teaching method on the learners' pragmatic competence. Therefore, the Mann- Whitney U test was conducted on explicit and implicit groups' pre- and post-test scores since the variables had significant values (e.g., teaching method: M=1.97, SE=.07; with Skewness of .05 (SE=.23), and Kurtosis of -1.53 (SE=.46)). The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test also confirmed this non-normal distribution (p=.000). The output of the Mann-Whitney U test indicated that there was a significant difference between explicit and implicit groups in the post- test (U= 263.5, p=.000) with medium effect size (d= 0.5) (Cohen, 1988) whereas the difference between these groups was small in the pre-tests (U=441, p=.01, d=0.2). Furthermore, the findings revealed that explicit groups had higher scores in the post-test indicating that explicit teaching was more effective in the treatment process. Table 2 illustrates the difference between the groups.

Table 2
Comparison of explicit and implicit groups

	Teaching Method	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	N
Pre-test	1 explicit	42.89	1630.00	38
	2 implicit	30.60	1071.00	35
	Total			73
Post-test	1 explicit	47.57	1807.50	38
	2 implicit	25.53	893.50	35
	Total			73

As shown in the table, while there was an increase in the scores of the students in the explicit teaching group in the post-test, the scores of the students in the implicit teaching group decreased, which is in accordance with other findings in the literature (e.g., Fukuya & Zhang, 2002; House, 1996; Takahashi, 2001; Tateyama et. al., 1997). Considering this, Bardovi-Harlig et al. (2015) have proposed that awareness raising activities and explicit instruction are significant in teaching pragmatics. Moreover, it emerged in the study of Nguyen et al. (2012) that explicit teaching was more effective in language learners' pragmatic competence than implicit. Finally, Nguyen et al. (2012) have suggested that the number of studies on the subject be increased to support the previous findings and more studies on implicit teaching be conducted. That the current study involved both explicit and implicit groups is in line with this suggestion and supports the findings in favor of explicit teaching of pragmatic competence, which can be regarded as a significant point of the preset study.

The effect of teaching pragmatic routines on spoken production was also investigated within the scope of the current study. For this purpose, the participants were administered an interactive task after three weeks, and a possible delayed effect of teaching was observed. However, only 3 of the participants used pragmatic routines after 3 weeks of instruction, indicating pragmatic instruction has no effect on spoken production. When compared with spoken production, it seems obvious that the effect of instruction on pragmatic competence is relatively higher, which provides evidence for the teachability of pragmatic competence through instruction. On the other hand, the findings of this study related to the effect of pragmatic instruction on spoken production should be supported by more evidence, so more studies could be conducted to fill this gap.

5.3. **The way how EFL learners regard pragmatic routines and their learning**

At the end of the treatment session, the participants were asked to reflect on the teaching process. To this end, they were provided with questions on a paper and asked to write about the questions: *Do you think this treatment session has been useful for you? Do you think the pragmatic routines taught were essential to learn and sufficient? Do you think the teaching method was useful for you? Did you have any problems during the treatment session?* As answers for these questions, all participants reported that the treatment session was useful since they had learned new vocabulary and improved their English. They also explained that the phrases were beneficial as they provided fluency while saving time. As for the sufficiency of the routines taught, most of the participants (*N*=60) wrote that the phrases were not enough as they wanted to learn more and carry on learning them.

In the last reflective task, the students were asked to write a metaphor for the speaking skills and pragmatic routines they had learned, thus stimulating critical thinking. A theme analysis was conducted by two researchers by coding the data in categories of positive and negative metaphors used. As a result of the Cohen's kappa analyses, it emerged that the level of inter-rater agreement was high (K= 0.8, p< 0.1)
Table 3 illustrates the participants' metaphors in the reflective task and states the reasons the students used them.

Table 3.
Reflections of the participants on pragmatic instruction

Metaphor used for pragmatic routines	The reason for their choice
A smiling on the face	"The pronunciation of some routines such as "Oh, my Gosh" and "Oh, Wow" is so nice that they make me smile" S17
Belief	"During this teaching process, I realized that I could learn them, so that made me believe that I also could learn English." S 32 / S68
A car	"When we drive it, it takes us wherever we want to go, but unless we drive it, it will be hard to arrive at our destination. Likewise, pragmatic routines help us achieve our goals. For example they benefit us in speaking exams." S 38 / S57
Pharmacy	"As we go to a pharmacy for our various health problems and they provide us with different medicine each time, the phrases we learned serve for different situations that we encounter in our daily life." S 77
First aid kit	"In case an emergency, first, we can resort to first aid kit. Likewise, these phrases save us from communication problems in English." S 7
Fish	"Like a fish, we might forget these phrases if we do not revise. " S 35
A star	"I found learning these routines difficult like touching the stars. Yet, when you learn these routines, you also become a star. " S 43
A life buoy	"They may be considered as trivial, but they can save us in conversation." S 42

Milk	"If I had drunken too much milk, I could be taller now. Similarly, If I had learned these routines earlier, I could speak English better now." S 9
A packet of jelly tots	"Like, jelly tots, all phrases are in different colors and taste as they are used for different situations." S 37
A tree	"As we learn more, we take roots and branch out in English." S 40
A path	"We enjoy walking on the path even though we are sometimes confused about where to go. At first, although we did not know where to go in this teaching process, we really enjoyed it in the end." S 45
A flower	"They revive and color our speaking in English." S 44
Riding a horse	"Even though riding a horse is difficult, it is easy to go on, and you do not want to dismount as you enjoy it a lot. Likewise, when you get used to these phrases, you do not want to stop learning them. " S 34
Meeting a new person	"You learn various aspects of language and communication in time. S 39

As can be seen in the table, the participants' reflections are positive. They find learning pragmatic routines essential in improving their speaking skills. This finding and the data collection method (using metaphors) are significant in two regards: firstly, learners participated in the reflection process, which often seems to be forgotten in the teaching process, but it enhances future teaching practices; secondly, the students were encouraged to improve their critical thinking skills since they were not merely asked for their ideas, but also to come up with a metaphor for their ideas, which is not ubiquitous in the related literature. Since the missing part of quantitative studies on pragmatic instruction seems to be the learners' views on the teaching process, this study considers this gap and puts forward cognitively comprehensive findings related to learners' views by using metaphors for the treatment session and, thus, pragmatic teaching in class.

6. Conclusion

The aim of the presented quasi-experimental study is to explore whether there is any effect of teaching pragmatic routines explicitly or implicitly on language learners' pragmatic competence and performance. The study sample includes 134 A2 level learners in a language program. Firstly, to address the research questions, a needs analysis was conducted to determine language skills and sub-skills that the participants consider areas of primary need. The result of this analysis revealed that speaking and pragmatic routines were the primary skills that they needed to improve. With respect to pragmatic routines, the second research question examined the possible effect of pragmatic instruction through routines on language learners' pragmatic competence and spoken production. The effect of explicit and implicit instruction on learning these routines was also examined through a five-week treatment. The last research question includes qualitative data by searching for learners' reflections on the treatment process through metaphors.

The findings of the study revealed that language learners regard speaking and pragmatic routines as the primary skills that need improvement. Furthermore, while there was a significant effect of explicit teaching on learners' pragmatic competence, there was no

obvious effect on spoken production. Consequently, learners reflected positively on the treatment session and stated that they would like to learn these phrases and other aspects of pragmatics. They used various metaphors for pragmatic routines, which has never been an issue in the related literature, making the findings unique. This finding may be considered important since it also encouraged learners to think critically; moreover, this highlighted the importance of learners' reflection on the teaching-learning process. Therefore, it could be suggested that reflective practices should be a constant part of teaching, and new and creative methods should be used to vary these practices. Furthermore, taking the findings on teaching pragmatics as the primary area of need into account, one implication might be that even though language learners cannot find many opportunities to interact with native speakers to practice the target language, they could be presented more pragmatic teaching materials and tasks, particularly regarding daily conversation.

As for the limitations, the number of the participants decreased because they did not show up in all sessions. Moreover, the study was carried out with only learners from the A2 level from a particular setting, so it makes it difficult to generalize the findings. Therefore, one suggestion could be to conduct the study with more participants with different backgrounds and in various settings. Finally, new reflection methods on varied phases and elements of language teaching could be employed in further studies.

References

Bardovi-Harlig, K. & Griffin, R. (2005). L2 pragmatic awareness: Evidence from the ESL classroom. *System, 33*, 401-415.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., Mossman, S. & Vellenga, H. E. (2015). The effect of instruction on pragmatic routines in academic discussion. *Language Teaching Research, 19*(3) 324–350.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by principles. An interactive approach to language pedagog*y (3rd ed.). New York: Pearson Education.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

Fukuya, Y. & Zhang, Y. (2002). The effects of recasts on EFL learners' acquisition of pragmalinguistic conventions of request. *Second Language Studies, 21* (1), 1–47.

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986).Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, *70*(2), 125-132.

House, J. (1996). Developing pragmatic fluency in English as a foreign language: routines and metapragmatic awareness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *18* (2), 225–252.

Jeon, E., & Kaya, T. (2006). Effects of L2 instruction on interlanguage pragmatic development: A metaanalysis. In J. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 165–211). Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Kasper, G. (1997). Can pragmatic competence be taught?. *NetWork*, *6*, 105-119.

Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). Interlanguage pragmatics: An introduction. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 3-15). New York: Oxford University Press.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K.R. (2001). Pragmatics in language teaching. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp.1-10). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Koike, D. A. & Pearson, L. (2005). The effect of instruction and feedback in the development of pragmatic competence. *System, 33,*481-501.

Martínez-Flor, A., & Fukuya, Y. J. (2005) .The effects of instruction on learners' production of appropriate and accurate suggestions. *System, 33*(3), 463-480.

Nguyen, T. T. M., Pham, T. H., & Pham, M. T. (2012).The relative effects of explicit and implicit form-focused instruction on the development of L2 pragmatic competence. *Journal of Pragmatics, 44*(4), 416-434.

Roever, C. (2012). What learners get for free: Learning of routine formulae in ESL and EFL environments?. *ELT Journal*, *66*, 10–21.

Rose, K.R. (2005). On the effects of instruction in second language pragmatics. *System, 33*, 385–399.

Shumin, K. (2002). Factors to consider: Developing adult EFL students' speaking abilities. *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice, 12*, 204-211.

Takahashi, S. (2001). The role of input enhancement in developing pragmatic competence. In K.R. Rose & G. Kasper, (Eds.), *Pragmatics in Language Teaching* (pp. 171–199). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tateyama, Y. (2001). Explicit and implicit teaching of pragmatic routines: Japanese sumimasen. In K. R Rose & G. Kasper, (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 200–222). New York:Cambridge University Press.

Tateyama, Y., Kasper, G., Mui, L. P., Tay, H. M., & Thananart, O. O. (1997). Explicit and implicit teaching of pragmatic routines. *Pragmatics and Language Learning, 8,* 163-178.

Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wesche, M., & Paribakht, T. S. (1996). Assessing second language vocabulary knowledge: Depth versus breadth. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *53*(1), 13-40.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Target pragmatic routines

- **Week 2-reacting to news**

*That's great/bad…*Yeah, good,   *How embarrassing,   *That sounds….,* Oh, I bet,
*you are kidding,   *Oh, really,   *Oh, Wow!   *Oh, my Gosh!   *No way!
     *Are you serious? *Yeah, I know.   *Really? How come?   * Oh, I see

---

Week 3- taking time to think and correct things you say
*Uh-huh,   *Um…well,   *Um, yes,   *well, actually,   *I mean

---

- **Week 4- vague expressions and responses**
*I don't know   *….and staff,   *I am not sure,   *it depends,   *I guess, …
*I think,….   *kind of/ sort of,   *in a way

- **Week 5- showing agreement**
*Me too/ Me neither   *I know,   *All right,   *Exactly/ definitely/absolutely!
* You're right.   *That's true   * That's for sure,   * I agree.   *Oh, yeah,

---

- **Week 6- dealing with interruptions**
*Just a minute/ second   *Excuse me just a second-   I'm sorry, hold on a second.
*Can you hold on a second?   * What were you saying?   *Where were we

---

Appendix B. CEFR descriptors for A2 speaking

Conversation: Can establish social contact: greetings and farewells; introductions; giving thanks. Can generally understand clear, standard speech on familiar matters directed at him/her, provided he/she can ask for repetition or reformulation from time to time. Can participate in short conversations in routine contexts on topics of interest. Can express how he/she feels in simple terms, and express thanks. Can handle very short social exchanges but is rarely able to understand enough to keep conversation going of his/her own accord, though he/she can be made to understand if the speaker will take the trouble. Can use simple everyday polite forms of greeting and address. Can make and respond to invitations, invitations and apologies. Can say what he/she likes and dislikes.

INFORMAL DISCUSSION (WITH FRIENDS): Can generally identify the topic of discussion around her which is conducted slowly and clearly. Can discuss what to do in the evening, at the weekend. Can make and respond to suggestions. Can agree and disagree with others.

GOAL-ORIENTED CO-OPERATION: Can understand enough to manage simple, routine tasks without undue effort, asking very simply for repetition when he/she does not understand. Can discuss what to do next, making and responding to suggestions, asking for and giving directions. Can indicate when he/she is following and can be made to understand what is necessary, if the speaker takes the trouble. Can communicate in simple and routine tasks using simple phrases to ask for and provide things, to get simple information and to discuss what to do next.

Appendix C. Vocabulary knowledge scale

Look at the following list of words and give each one a number rating 1-5 based on how well you know the word.

Look at the VKS (Vocabulary Knowledge Scale)[1] below:
1. I don't remember having seen this word before.
2. I have seen this word before but I don't know what it means
3. I have seen this word before and I think it means …
4. I know this word: It means….
5. I can use this word in a sentence e.g…….

English	1-5	Türkçe
What were you saying?		
Oh…Wow!		
Oh, yeah		
Really? How come?		
Um, yes/ Um…well		
You are kidding!		
Oh, I see,		
Well, actually		
Me neither		
I mean		
How embarrassing		
Oh, really, , , , ,		
Yeah, good		
I know/ I don't know		
Uh-huh,		
Excuse me just a second		
All right		
Where were we?		
That's for sure,		
in a way		
I am not sure		
Oh, my gosh		
That's great/bad…,		
and staff, ,		
I guess,		
I'm sorry, hold on a second		
You're right		
Oh, I bet,		

Adapted from Wesche, M., & Paribakht, T. S. (1996).Assessing second language vocabulary knowledge: Depth versus breadth. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *53*(1), 13-40.

Appendix D. A material used in the instruction for explicit teaching group

Vague expressions and responses:

> We use;
>
> *I don't know, ...and staff,   I am not sure,   it depends,   I guess,   I think, kind of/ sort of, in a way* when our response is not clear

A.   Maria and Dora are talking about their future plans. Read their dialog and answer the questions.
1.   What topics are they talking about?
2.   Are they sure about their plans?

Maria: So, Dora. What are you going to when you graduate?
Dora: I don't know. It depends on my grades. Maybe, I will work at our family company, but it is boring in a way. What about you?
Maria: I think it is kind of weird, but I don't have any ideas. I am not sure, but I can travel around Europe before I start to work. Who knows?
Dora: Uh-huh. What about marriage?
Maria: Are you kidding? I won't think about marriage and staff for a long time, I guess.
Dora: Yeah, let's wait and see then.

B.   Read the dialog again and underline the vague expressions
C.   Read the sentences below and complete them with the given expressions:

1.   It gets noisy. (kind of)
      …………………………………………………………………………………..
2.   I don't know what to do. (I am not sure)
      …………………………………………………………………………………
3.   She doesn't like festivals (and staff)
      …………………………………………………………………………………
4.   It's irritating (in a way)
      …………………………………………………………………………………
5.   They don't have anything better to do (I guess)
      …………………………………………………………………………………..
      It's your turn
      Choose five vague expressions and write your own dialogs.