Exploring Pragmatic Awareness of Prospective Teachers of English as a Foreign Language and their Reflections on Pragmatic Knowledge and Practices

Houda KHABCHECHE [1], Fatiha HAMITOUCHE [2]

[1]Houda KHABCHECHE (Setif 2 University, Algeria),
houdakhabcheche@gmail.com
[2]Fatiha HAMITOUCHE (Algiers 2 University, Algeria),
f_hamitouche@yahoo.com

Abstract:

Pragmatic competence has become a crucial component of language teacher education. Prospective English as Foreign Language (EFL) teachers should be aware of the pragmatic challenges of the target language and the importance of developing their learners' pragmatic competence. However, most language teachers focus on grammar and vocabulary as they may lack pragmatic awareness of the target language, or they may struggle in setting their pragmatic knowledge into practice. This study explores the pragmatic awareness of 90 master's degree students, majored in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL). Data were collected through reflection papers about the sample's strengths and weaknesses as regards pragmatics and how they evaluate the pragmatic course they have partaken at university with the perceived adequacy of teaching pragmatics. Therefore, participants were asked to design a pragmatically-focused lesson plan to examine their ability to transfer their pragmatic knowledge into practice. The findings have indicated that prospective EFL teachers' pragmatic awareness was mostly located in the level of theoretical pragmatics; moreover, lesson plan evaluations revealed that the study informants found it challenging to transfer pragmatic knowledge into practical pragmatic lessons.

Keywords: Instructional pragmatics, pragmatic awareness, prospective TEFL teachers, language teacher education

---

Corresponding author: Houda KHABCHECHE,

1. INTRODUCTION

Over the past five decades, pragmatics has become gradually an independent discipline and in language pedagogy a crucial stream to be incorporated into the curriculum. Since 1972 with Dell Hymes's sociolinguistic theory of Communicative Competence, it has been recognized that second/foreign language teaching and learning are no more limited to grammar, vocabulary and phonology, yet there is a need to consider the use of language appropriately in its social contexts and how to express intentions and understand those of interlocutors. Subsequently, pragmatic competence has become a vital component of communicative competence (Canal & Swain, 1980; Bachman, 1990; Ishihara, 2011), and as the teacher is the "main agent" (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010, p. 21) in the classroom practices. Awareness of pragmatics knowledge and its application in language teaching has been considered as a critical part in language teachers' education.

Vàsquez & Sharpless (2009) state that:

> Knowledge about pragmatics is important for language teachers because pragmatic competence—that is, the ability to express appropriately a range of language functions—is a major component of those theoretical models of communicative competence (i.e., Canale & Swain, 1980; Bachman & Palmer, 1996) which have most influenced communicative approaches to English language teaching. Communicative language teaching stresses that in order to be effective language users, learners need to know about more than the formal system of the target language—they must also know how to use the language in socially appropriate ways. (p.6)

Accordingly, it is a key need for teacher educators to enhance pre-and in-service teachers' ability to recognize, interpret and explain to their language learners the sociocultural meanings associated with oral, written, and nonverbal communication (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; p.1). To date, and to the author's knowledge, no study in the Algerian context explored what is the stance of pragmatic knowledge awareness in the Algerian Master's degree students in TEFL, as prospective teachers. Ergo, an exploration of their strengths and weaknesses in pragmatics and the extent to which they are able to transfer their theoretical pragmatic knowledge into a practical lesson plan.

2. Background of the Study

Awareness of pragmatic knowledge and its application is notably significant for language teachers, as one of the key responsibilities of the contemporary globalized world, language learners are to be equipped with pragmatic competence for the success of cross-cultural communications. Hergüner & Çakır (2017) claim that

> "most of the burden still remains on the shoulders of the pre-service education. Pre-service education is considered to be the most important step in a teacher's professional life, in which most of the beliefs, strategies, dispositions and skills of teaching a foreign language is acquired". (p. 1518)

However, the relevant research evaluating the involvement of pragmatics in teacher education programs is mainly about pragmatic theories

rather than on how to prepare teachers for translating that pragmatics knowledge and those theories into practical applications by preparing prospective language teachers for instructional pragmatics (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). In a nationwide survey in the U.S. conducted by Vàsquez & Sharpless (2009), findings reveal that although the majority of master's-level TESOL programs in the U.S. incorporate pragmatics in teacher education curriculum in some way or other, the treatment of pragmatics in teacher training courses is mostly theoretical such as speech act and politeness theories rather than on practical applications. Vásquez and Sharpless's (2009) survey exposes that among approximately100 graduate TESOL programs in the U.S., only 20% reported having a course dedicated to pragmatics while nearly half incorporated pragmatics into other relevant courses. Of the 20% of the programs that had a course dedicated to pragmatics, more courses (56%) reported having a theoretical rather than an applied orientation (44%). As one of the quotes from the survey responses in the paper displays (p. 17), it is sometimes assumed that as long as they are given theory, language teachers can devise instructional strategies on their own (Ishihara, 2011).

In EFL contexts, incorporating pragmatics in language teacher education may be more limited than in an ESL context. According to Ishihara (2011, p. 2), pragmatic (or sociolinguistic) competence is often rarely defined among the published methods textbooks designed for Japanese pre-service undergraduate teacher preparation (Mochizuki, 2010; Tsuchiya & Hirono, 2008). She adds that the centralized nationwide curriculum in Japan, includes only few courses in English language teaching toward initial licensure. These courses are mainly designed to teach: the history of English language teaching, the teaching of grammar, vocabulary, and general four skills, materials development, and assessment, minor discussions of cultural understanding, without a clear indication of whether and to what extent pragmatics or interlanguage pragmatics is introduced. Moreover, Hagiwara (cited in Ishihara, 2011, p.2) assumes that "most of us [language educators in Japan] have never studied pragmatics as an independent subject or a course at the university we attended" (2010, p. 4). She goes on to state that the implementation of a survey like Vásquez and Sharpless' is in itself indicative of more "advanced" status of language teacher education in the U.S. in the realm of pragmatics, which she describes as "enviable" (ibid, p. 4). It may be concluded that pragmatics is still underrepresented in Japanese language teacher education and language teachers are left to their own in teaching pragmatics and developing their learners' pragmatic competence.

3.   Review of the Literature

3.1 Pragmatic Awareness in EFL Teachers' Education

Vàsquez (2011) explains that pragmatic instruction in the FL/SL classroom needs to include pragmatics as a part of the language teacher's content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge base. However, "some scholars (Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor, 2003; Cohen, 2005; Eslami-

Rasekh, 2005; Ishihara, 2007) have claimed that pragmatics as well as strategies for teaching pragmatics in the language classroom is an area that is not adequately addressed by most TESL and TEFL teacher preparation programs". Eslami and Eslami-Razekh (2008) confirm that "non-native English-speaking teacher candidates (NNESTCs) feel insecure about their English language proficiency and their pragmatic competence may be weaker than their organizational competence (Eslami-Rasekh, 2005; Pasternak & Bailey, 2004)" (p.179). In addition, English as a Second Language (ESL) teacher education programs do not seem to concentrate on pragmatic features of language neither train the teacher candidates in teaching the pragmatic dimensions of language (Biesenback-Lucas, 2003; Rose, 1997). The only available teacher preparation sources typically include chapters teaching the four major skills which would result in some declarative knowledge of grammar but not pragmatics. Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (1997), Eslami-Rasekh (2005) and Rose (1997) are the only sources who have addressed the issue of pragmatics in ESL teacher education programs.

It should be noted that all the above-mentioned challenges in language teacher education are compared to what many researchers (Bardovi-Harlig, 1992; Eslami, 2010; Hartford, 1997; Ishihara, 2010; Karatepe, 2001; Kasper, 1997; Meier, 2003; Rose, 1997; Yates & Wigglesworth, 2005; Shulman, 1987) have labeled as "qualifications of an effective teacher of L2 pragmatics". In view of that, they have stated that these qualifications include but are not limited to the awareness of pragmatic norms and pragmatic variation associated with subject matter knowledge. Henceforth, the ability to provide pragmatic-focused instruction and assessment would serve the pedagogical content knowledge, wherein sensitivity to learners' cultures and subjectivity could be stimulated by means of corresponding their actual knowledge and educational context.

Ishihara (2011) argues:

Few of these qualities seem to come automatically to language teachers without specific preparation focused on instructional pragmatics. Currently, at least a few programs in the U.S. offer pedagogically-centered courses in L2 pragmatics, either as required or elective courses. Not surprisingly, however, the effects of such courses and other teacher development opportunities in instructional pragmatics have hardly been researched, except for a few recent attempts. (p. 2)

Although research of over the past two decades (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Kasper, 2001; Rose, 2005) has demonstrated that pragmatic teaching is feasible, is effective, and makes a significant difference, encouraging teachers to incorporate it into their curricula and researchers to focus on more specific aspects of practical teaching methods (Glaser, 2014). Few contemporary studies examine the teaching effectiveness and pragmatics for future and in-service language teachers.

3.2 Instructional Pragmatics in EFL Teachers' Education

Among these few studies, Eslami and Eslami-Razekh (2008, p.179) examined the effects of metapragmatic instruction on the pragmatic awareness and production in non-native English-speaking teacher candidates (NNESTCs) in a quasi-experimental design. EFL Context Iran. Fifty-two master students are studying Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) at Azad University in Najafabad, Iran participated in the study, they were assigned to an experimental group that consisted of 25 students who went through the ESL methodology course with a pragmatic focus, and a control group of 27 MA students studying TESL at the same university who went through the same ESL Methodology course without a pragmatic focus. Participants have studied English in the classroom for approximately nine years and hold a bachelor's degree in a related field (English translation, TESL or English literature). The experimental group received the metapragmatic instruction based on a pragmatic awareness-raising approach that included reading assignments for cross-cultural, cross-linguistic, and instructional pragmatics research, activities for communicative practice activities, and participants' ethnographic studies of participants. The results showed that the experimental group performed better than the control group that did not receive metapragmatic instruction, suggesting that the explicit metapragmatic instruction was effective. The research reveals that the teaching effect of second language pragmatics is feasible in the context of EFL, and the authors suggest that the teaching and learning of pragmatics should be regarded as an important aspect of language teacher education in TEFL/TESL teaching method textbooks and syllabi.

Also, the Seminar on Language Teacher Education and Second Language Pragmatics at the 18th Pragmatics and Language Learning Conference held in Kobe, Japan, 2010 by Eslami, Ishihara, Vásquez, and Vellenga presented their research on the impact of teaching pragmatics on language teacher education. Group members taught and explored the development of teaching pragmatics in teacher education programs in EFL and ESL settings. They discussed their findings, including achievements and challenges. For example, Ishihara (2010) had extensively studied how teacher cognition evolves in classroom discourse about language teacher development. She conducted an ethnographic case study to describe the co-development of teacher cognition related to pragmatic awareness documented in a professional development workshop dedicated to teaching pragmatics. The seminar was a five-hour component in an intensive 30-hour teacher development program for re-certifying secondary teaching licensure in Japan. The pragmatics-focused seminar was built on interaction among participants and the instructor. Data consisted of seven of the participant teachers' documents, the instructor's field notes, and recordings of the teacher development seminar. The findings and analysis placed a particular focus on the process in which one of the

teacher's pragmatic awareness was challenged, co-constructed, and reshaped in interaction through a critical learning episode.

Vàsquez (2010) surveyed the perceptions of her former students who had taken the pragmatics course in the MA TESL course with her over the past five years to determine whether they had been able to incorporate what they learned in the pragmatics course into their subsequent ESL/EFL (and, in some cases, other language) teaching. Participants answered open-ended questions in an email questionnaire about the main subject areas and techniques they used to teach pragmatics to their ESL/EFL students, the biggest challenges teachers faced when bringing pragmatics into language courses barriers, as well as some unexpected learning outcomes that students associated with this course. She concluded that most teachers discussed different ways of dealing with pragmatics in their own language teaching, suggesting that it is possible to teach it to prospective and practicing ESL/EFL teachers, and to equip them with some tools and techniques for addressing pragmatics in their language classrooms. For language teacher educators, it cannot be assumed that knowledge about pragmatics (content knowledge) and knowing how to teach pragmatics (pedagogical knowledge) is something that language teachers will automatically discover on their own.

Some of the most experienced teachers in her sample indicated that even though they had received some formal training in this area, and even though they recognized their learners would benefit from pragmatics instruction; they still found it a challenge to incorporate pragmatics into their classes in a pre-planned fashion. This discovery underscores the need for MA-TESL programs to continue to support developing teachers' knowledge bases in this area. The implications of teaching language teachers about pragmatics may extend well beyond their L2 classrooms. Emphasizing the "real world" relevance and implications of pragmatic competencies as important as pragmatic failure in the EFL curriculum. Moreover, knowledge acquired in this area may extend to other domains of teachers' lives as well, influencing how they perceive and come to understand their interactions with others. In this respect, we believe that a little bit of awareness raising goes a long way. Finally, the greatest obstacle seems to be navigating within program or curricular constraints. Future instructional efforts may need to focus on helping our Master's degree students in TESL to consider creative ways of incorporating pragmatics into existing curricula: in other words, working within curricular constraints, and figuring out how to address pragmatics in a wider variety of language courses.

Eslami (2010) incorporated instructional pragmatics into an ESL Methodology course, where course requirements were reading the literature on interlanguage and instructional pragmatics and teaching Taiwanese EFL students through computer-mediated communication. Students' reflective journals, online discussions and instructor's field notes revealed the effect of instructional pragmatics in an ESL methodology course on graduate students' pragmatic awareness and the challenges they faced as they taught pragmatics

to EFL learners. Similarly, Vellenga (2010) asked volunteer instructor participants to teach a series of lessons on pragmatics to university-aged (19-23) ESL learners in ESL and EFL contexts.

Instructor responses to demographic questionnaires, comments on lesson checklists and responses to mid- and post-teaching interviews show that there is value to Continuing Professional Development (CPD) on the topic of how to teach pragmatics for teachers with a range of previous experience in a variety of contexts. They exhibited interest and enthusiasm for this aspect of language teaching.

Most of the studies discussed above represent seminal work examining the impact of pedagogical pragmatics in teacher education but there is much less research on the pragmatic strengths and weaknesses of future teachers and their ability to translate pragmatic knowledge into practical knowledge. To the all-inclusive knowledge of the researcher and after reviewing the associated literature on the Algerian Scientific Journals (ASJP), there is a very little research that translate practical lesson plans, especially in the Algerian context. Therefore, this study aims to examine, through a reflective dissertation, the strengths and weaknesses of 90 master students majoring in teaching English as a foreign language in pragmatics, and how they evaluate the pragmatics courses they take at university and whether they do so, thinking that teaching pragmatics is enough. In addition, prospective TEFL teachers are examined for their ability to design a practically oriented lesson plans through which they translate their pragmatic knowledge into application(s).

4. Research Questions

Thus, along the same line of the abovementioned studies, this study addresses the following research questions:

1. What are TEFL prospective teachers' strengths and weaknesses as regards pragmatics and how do they evaluate the pragmatic course they had at the university?

2. To what extent are TEFL prospective teachers aware of the pragmatic features to be taught?

3. How capable are TEFL prospective teachers to incarnate a pragmatically-focused lesson plan into practice?

5. Methodology

The current study is exploratory research that adopts a mixed method approach to explore TEFL prospective teachers' pragmatic awareness and their ability to translate pragmatic knowledge into practical applications.

5.1 Participants

Participants of the present study are 90 Master students of English majoring in Teaching English as a Foreign Language TEFL in the department of English at Mohamed Lamine Debaghine Setif 2 University. Eighty two percent of them are females and 18% are males. Their ages are between 21-27. The participants have taken a pragmatics course in their first year of master level, its content was about pragmatics theories such as: politeness

theory, speech act theory, cooperative principle, conversational implicature, presuppositions, deixis, and reference.

5.2 Instruments

Data were collected in the current research through a reflection paper written by 90 master students majoring in teaching English as a foreign language TEFL. They were asked to reflect on their strengths and weaknesses as regards pragmatics and how do they evaluate the pragmatic course they took the year before, if they are able to teach pragmatics and what are the teaching approaches they know about the teaching of pragmatics. Besides, participants were asked to plan and design a pragmatically-lesson plan about a pragmatic feature they choose by themselves.

5.2.1 Reflections

The concept of reflection dates back to the work of John Dewey (1933) who defined it as an "active, persistent and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it and the further conclusion to which it tends" as cited in Huang (2012, p.3). Dewey's idea of reflective learning entails a state of perplexity in which thinking originates as an act of inquiry that will resolve the perplexity. Since then, Huang (2012), Boud et al. (1985) and others have all attempted to describe reflective processes using various terms, such as knowing-in-action, reflective learning, experiential learning, transformative learning, metacognitive reflection, mindfulness, awareness, critical analysis and change, among others. Therefore, Boud et al. (1985) defined reflection in the context of learning as a standard concept denoting that individuals engage in exploring their experiences with the motive of attaining new understandings and appreciations through scholarly and affective activities.

Reflection in this study is defined as "the process of internally examining and exploring an issue of concern, triggered by an experience, which creates and clarifies meaning in terms of self, and which results in a changed . . . perspective" (Boyd & Fales, 1983, p. 100, as cited Huang, 2012, p.4). In this research, reflection papers aimed at better understanding the strengths and weaknesses of prospective TEFL teachers, as regards pragmatics, whether they are able to teach what they learnt from the previous pragmatic course. In addition, participants were asked to evaluate the course they had the previous academic year and if they are aware of pragmatics teaching approaches and if they are able to translate their pragmatic knowledge into teaching practices through a practical lesson plan.

5.2.2 Lesson Plan Task

A "task" is defined as "an activity that involves individuals in using language for the purpose of achieving a particular goal or objective in a particular situation" (Bachman & Palmer, 1996, p. 44). In this study, prospective TEFL teachers were asked to design a pragmatically-focused lesson plan about any pragmatic feature they choose, to evaluate if they are able to translate their theoretical pragmatic knowledge into a practical lesson plan.

6. Data Analysis and Discussion of the Findings

To answer the research questions of this exploratory research, data collected from reflection papers were coded and categorised according to the emerging themes. In addition, lesson plans were evaluated based on Ishihara & Cohen (2010, p.191) rubric for assessing the pragmatics lesson plan.

Given that, the analysis of 90 reflection papers of the prospective English teachers under scrutiny have revealed the lack of pragmatic knowledge and pedagogy among the students at the beginning of the course which goes in conformity with findings of previous research. The latter entail that pragmatics is not addressed in careers of master's cycle and that of teachers' education (Biesenback-Lucas, 2003; Eslami-Rasekh, 2005; Vasquez & Sharpless, 2009).

As one of the participants reflected:

"We didn't practice for example how to communicate with native speakers in the right context, we have learned theories eg: politeness, conversation…we didn't practice English with native speakers who are different from us and this is what we need to practice in pragmatics."

Alike, this claim is strengthened by further instances taken from the participants' reflection papers:

"The neglection of such crucial field lead to real misconception of some language context and components and functions."

"As being graduated from the classical system I didn't learn about pragmatics but I've learnt, through training, that language should be taught in authentic situation."

Similarly, several other teacher learners' reflections discussed examples of how the issue of pragmatics was not considered either when they learned English or in their undergraduate programs. The reflections show strong evidence that the teacher learners' knowledge of pragmatics and pragmatic instruction was enhanced.

In order to explore the pragmatic awareness of prospective teachers of English and their views about pragmatic knowledge and practices, reflection papers were gathered. For this purpose, total of 90 reflection papers were analyzed through content analysis as the first phase of the study.

In these reflection papers, therefore, the participants were requested first to determine their strengths and weaknesses as regards pragmatics. To get in-depth information about the contextual problems the respondents have faced and to understand whether they are able to adapt their pragmatic knowledge into the teaching practice, they were also required to evaluate the pragmatics course they had at university and how its teaching process was, then to determine whether they have sufficient pragmatic knowledge about the English language. After that, the study aimed to indicate whether they are able to teach the pragmatic knowledge at any level (middle school, secondary school, private school, ESP) and eventually to explore whether they are aware about the teaching approaches of pragmatics in the EFL classroom or not.

6. 1 Participants' Strengths and Weaknesses as Regards Pragmatics

The average of fifty-eight (64%) of the 90 reflection papers prospective teachers made no explicit reference to the strengths and weaknesses related to their pragmatic levels. In the remaining 32 papers (36%); it is observed that 8 prospective teachers reflected on their strengths and weaknesses yet in general and implicit way, whereas 24 though they acknowledged them both they either confirmed that their weaknesses, to a large extent, outweigh their strengths as regards pragmatics or they reported the weaknesses only as they consider themselves pragmatically weak. The samples below are examples from the participants' reflection papers:

"Because of pragmatics I can say I'm more effective communicator, I can express myself more without fear of judgment. But I also still have some problems in understanding some pragmatic features."

"The strengths of studying pragmatics are to be able to understand the meaning behind what we say but the weaknesses are that we can't practice in our real life we need to apply it with native speakers."

"I think that my weaknesses regarding pragmatics are more than my strengths because till now what we were dealing with was only theory thus if we were put in a real context i.e., cross cultural communication we would have many problems. Besides, I still cannot have enough pragmatic knowledge about the English language."

"I don't have any strength regarding pragmatics since we don't practise speaking in the English language, we don't understand pragmatics. It is difficult concept of the language."

"I don't have any strengths in pragmatics, it was and still my weakness point. It was not clear for me since the first session I studied this module. I have never understood the use or the point of studying this module. Sometimes I understand the lesson but I can't apply it or even much it to the next lesson…"

"To be honest with, I found myself weak when dealing with pragmatics. The question is not what is your level in pragmatic, the question is why you believe that you are poor in pragmatic. The reason is and was the way we taught this field two years of studying it and I never realized why we are being taught pragmatic."

Based on the above excerpts of Master's TEFL students, there is a weakness in their pragmatic competence, as it is inadequately addressed.

6.2 Participants' Evaluation of Master1 Pragmatics' Course and its Teaching Methodology

This following up question was raised to get a clearer idea about the contextual problems the prospective teachers faced. Then, this section reports how the participants actually have taken the pragmatics' course and their views about the pragmatics' teaching methodology.

From the 90 reflection papers, 37 (42%) of them neither provided an evaluation about the pragmatics course nor demonstrate their impressions about its way of teaching in the classroom.

It is worth noting that the 53 participants (58%) who gave their feedbacks to this question generally focused on the first part (pragmatics' course evaluation) more than the second one (pragmatics' teaching methodology). Moreover, it was illustrated through their written reflections that:

a) The common answer among 31 out of 53 that the pragmatics' course was taught theoretically only.

As one of the subjects replied, *"in last year's pragmatics course it was all theoretical I would have liked if it dealt with practice more on how to teach pragmatical aspect in the EFL classroom."*

Another one commented, *"Though pragmatics is very interesting module unfortunately it was boring last years because of the lack of practice, it was just theoretical lessons."*

Another added, *"At the university the courses of pragmatics are useless they are just theories that can't help you to reach the correct way of teaching such module."*

Another responded, *"It was only theoretical…it was receptive course in nature. The teacher was lecturing and we were taking notes there was no practical side."*

b) The common answer among 19 out of the number of 53 that the course was in a form of presentations by reporting such adjectives for instance: difficult, hard, complex, complicated, sophisticated.

As one of the participants emphasized, *"The pragmatic course of the last year was very complicated even though it was about simple aspects and it was all about presentations."*

Another participant also replied:
"the first semester was about presentations, it was a little bit hard for us to remember all of them…this module was really hard because most of the elements are interrelated and somehow resemble each other."

In brief, it can be said that on one hand the course was theoretical and on the other hand was delivered through presentations as one of the respondents concluded, *"last year it was only theoretical presentations."*

In the same vein, another one added:
"I've found pragmatics a boring module because we're just presenting projects, I didn't know if the information that I am receiving is accurate or not. The pragmatic course was taught theoretically in one hour and half the teacher gave us many information but I couldn't get the idea that she used to express."

As it can be understood from the reflection papers, the participants felt unsatisfied and hold a negative attitude. Only 3 of them who indicated positive reflections for the pragmatic course and its application in the classroom. One example is as follows:
"I think the course it was good because we were engaged in and the illustration and the example were given based on real life situations."

Regarding the teaching method of pragmatics at Mohamed Lamine Debaghine University was echoed explicitly by eight participants from the whole population, who admitted that the way how it was taught is not appropriate as they stated below respectively:
"I don't like the way pragma is taught here may be the teacher could add some visual aids making role play. I mean if the teacher can engage the student in the lecture. Also, I appreciate if we can do practice."

"I don't like the way of teaching pragmatics course in Mohamed Lamine Debaghine University because this module is new for the students and they do not know the objective of the course and the concepts are very new. The students face a big problem in understand it."

"Regarding the pragmatics course that we had last year, it was very difficult and incomprehensible. The methodology of the teacher hinders our comprehension which lead to have a large number of weaknesses in this course."

"Last year's pragmatics course was useless for me… the method of teaching pragmatics was very useless."

"For me the way of teaching pragmatics in Setif 2 University is the thing that makes it difficult because just reading the other researchers' theories is not the appropriate method. There is a need for something practical and beneficial for students."

"The pragmatics course of last year was very good but the way of teaching it was not good."

Furthermore, some participants go further to declare their unfamiliarity with pragmatics and its meaning by admitting that, *"they have never heard about pragmatic module and they did not know what the word pragmatics means till they came to university and started to study this module in the third year."*

In the same context, one of the prospective teachers argued:

"Unfortunately, this very interesting module has only been introduced during the 3rd year which I think was very late if we take into consideration the importance of pragmatics in the field of linguistics and in the field of language in general… with only one year of instruction in the field of pragmatics it'd be very difficult for them to implement and integrate pragmatic features in their future lessons."

Other prospective teacher added, *"It is vague field for us as beginners, 2 years are not enough and we are expected to be beginners."*

Based on the above-mentioned findings, it is noticed that teachers have depended overwhelmingly on theory while teaching pragmatics. Given that,

➢ pragmatics should be taught from the early stages as one the respondents recommended in his reflection paper,

"In my opinion pragmatics should be learned at the middle school because students have to learn language use + language usage."

Similarly, one confirmed: *"pragmatics should be integrated in the middle school as far as secondary school."*

Also, another one proposed: « *I think we need to focus on pragmatics since first year at university.* »

To conclude this part as one of the respondents suggested:

"For me I think that when a person wants to reach a high level on whether learning or teaching pragmatics, I think it should take more than 2 years to acquire the enough knowledge about how to understand pragmatics and how to use it in daily life situation."

➢ The focus should be directed from theoretical to the practical orientation i.e., from pragmatic knowledge (content pragmatics) to instructional pragmatics (pedagogical pragmatics). Given this, the participants through their reflections insisted on practical side which is a must

for them and want their teachers not to base on the theory only but to refer to the practice instead as it is clarified below:

"pragmatic has to do with much more with practise."

"...it would be preferable if the lessons were sustained by practice inorder to be stored effectively in our minds."

"we were taught theoritically, we were in a massive need to put it into practice, to know how we can teach it, the aims behind it, it's importance"

6.3 Participants' Evaluation of the Sufficiency of their Pragmatic Knowledge

In terms of determining the amount of pragmatic knowledge whether it is sufficient or not three different comments gathered from the 90 reflection papers. To precise, 23 of the participants (26%) did not provide any information about this question i.e., they were neutral in the sense that they neither replied positively nor negatively. And 11 (12%) of them responded with "yes" but still their answers seemed to yield a conflicting data: On one hand, the subjects provided a positive declaration and on the other hand, they admitted their need to learn more about pragmatic knowledge and to know how to use it appropriately and practically.

As a result, one of the participants acknowledged, *"I think I've got some pragmatic knowledge about the English language, but still I lack many (we just keep learning)."*

This is echoed by another participant who argued, *"I think I have enough pragmatic knowledge about the English language. However, this knowledge is not complete because I still rely on books and articles to understand some notions in pragmatics."*

Another one added:

"I have enough knowledge, pragmatically speaking, of the English language and I believe that this knowledge can help me develop the pragmatic competence of my learners though it would be mostly as far as the theoretical aspect is concerned."

Other prospective teacher concluded, *"As for whether I have enough pragmatic knowledge about the English language or not, I think that this is a very relative question since pragmatic knowledge cannot be delimited. But still, due to the long years I've spent in constant contact with the language I do believe that to a certain extent…"*

Meanwhile, 56 (62%) of the participants responded with "no" and they highlighted that their level in pragmatics is not good as it is displayed clearly below:

"In reality there is a big lack of pragmatic knowledge in our learning experience about English language."

"I really don't have enough knowledge about pragmatics, I find it somehow difficult to be understood."

"As future teacher, I still have to explore pragmatics and to get more knowledge…"

"Honestly speaking, our knowledge in pragmatics can be seen as very poor knowledge which prevent us from being teachers of pragmatics in the future in any level."

Thus, the participants referring to their written reflections as related to this question have exposed a lack of pragmatic knowledge. They are unsatisfied about their pragmatic level and incredulous about the amount of pragmatics knowledge they have learnt so far. This is definitely acknowledged through a participant who confirmed, *"Actually, I'm not convinced or satisfied about my level in pragmatics."* He further added: *"Actually pragmatics is deep and vague field need a long time to be covered, this is why am not convinced that I have enough knowledge about pragmatic, in addition pragmatics needs performance."*

Taking this into account, the question that should, in turn, be raised: are the participants as future teachers able to teach this pragmatic knowledge or not?

6.4 The Respondents' Ability to teach the Pragmatic Knowledge at the Various Educational Levels

There were only 15 (17%) reflection papers with no answers gathered from the participants in which they did not reflect on their ability to put their pragmatic knowledge into practice. 75 (83%) from the 90 reflection papers, in total, provided information about whether the prospective teachers are able to teach the pragmatic knowledge at the educational settings or not as it is clearly specified in the question above. In this regard, 33 (36%) of them though they responded positively through their reflections to their pragmatic application in the classroom,

a. On one side they commonly declared that *"they have only some basic pragmatics knowledge to use it and improve it."* In the same regard, one of them exemplified: *"honestly speaking I can't say that I have enough pragmatics knowledge about the English language because English is vague and we have talked only few points."*

Also, they remarkably used such expressions in their answers: **"I think", "Maybe" "BUT"**, **"If", "only"** which, in fact, displayed their indecision and uncertainty about their ability to do so as one of the participants declared this point clearly, *"for my ability to include pragmatics in my teaching, **I really doubt in that** though I'm eager to know more how to include it."*

Similarly, another one acknowledged: *"I'm **not sure** that I can teach the pragmatic knowledge at any level because it demands high level of proficiency of language and practice."*

Below are more instances from prospective teachers' reflections:

*"As future teacher **maybe** we are able to teach **but** we have to follow a syllabus."*

*"I **think** that I can teach it but with some guidance and practice first in order for me to translit my message clearly and fluently."*

*"I **may** teach the knowledge I have; however, I cannot work out the new one and teach it."*

*"I can teach it **but not** as an excellent teacher because we lack the practical side of pragmatics."*

*"Teaching pragmatics is a **challenging task** that requires it full mastery, I'm able to teach **just** the aspect I have really understand and **not all** of them (pragmatics aspects)."*

*"We **may** teach what we [have been] taught **but** this not enough."*

b. And on the other side, they reflected distinct educational levels:

Eight of the reflection papers did not indicate any educational setting and only two who did so but implicitly and without clarifying the setting exactly. This can be illustrated as follows: *"I **think** I **would be** able to teach pragmatics to adult learners. Younger learners **would be** a little more complicated to teach."* Similarly, *"I'm able **only** to teach pragmatic for very beginner learners and I **don't have the ability** to teach complex one."* Opposing to that, six of the participants declared to teach pragmatic knowledge with any level yet only if it is developed to be able to do so as one said: *"I **think** I can teach it **at any level if** I strength my knowledge about the pragmatical aspects."*

Moreover, eight of them stated to do that for both middle and secondary school with making efforts and not in private schools nor in ESP fields as they confirmed that *"for private school and ESP it is somehow high levels that need more, a high competence from teacher, special and expert peoples."* Alike another respondent asserted, *"I **think** I'm able to teach it in middle school or secondary school **but** with extra effort and research."* In the same vein, 5 of them think that they could teach pragmatic knowledge at middle school only and 2 at secondary school only as one of the participants argued, *"I could teach it **but not** in perfect way specially for higher level **maybe** I could cover most of the points for middle school learners but not for ESP learners."* On contrary to that, the remaining two participants opted for the choice of ESP.

Meanwhile, the 42 participants (47%) responded negatively to this question and obviously affirmed their inability to teach pragmatic knowledge at any level as one of them, for instance, acknowledged: *"Most of us are not able to teach it in any institution."* Additionally, such reasons were notably repeated in their reflection papers: 'It is difficult to teach it, it needs a deep understanding - a lot of experience and great knowledge, not any one can teach it, need of a good mastery, it needs a high level of proficiency of language and practice, we lack of background and method to teach pragmatic knowledge, we need extensive research to be able to teach it, we should have a rich background and practice.'

In this regard, they remarked respectively:

"I think it is a challenging for us to teach pragmatics at any level."

"No, because I don't have enough knowledge about pragmatics, what I studied before was only theories there were no practice at all, so what is the reasons behind knowing conversational implicature, diexes for example. Am I going to name them while I'm talking?"

"No, I am not able to teach these pragmatic knowledge because I don't pave the way to teach such knowledge…to teach or learn such module you need a huge effort. First to understand it and then to apply it"

"it is true that I leaned some notions and aspects about pragmatics but I think it is very limited and I'll not be able to teach pragmatics or even communicate successfully in various situations. I need to practice more and to further my knowledge about pragmatics with authentic examples and in real situations."

"For teaching this module I personally can't teach any level because I need more understanding and practice."

"I'm not able to teach pragmatic knowledge at any level because I need more training."

"I think it is very difficult to teach these pragmatic knowledge, we are MA students need more training to master those knowledge because they are too abstract."

Generally speaking, as it can be understood from the participants' reflection papers vis-à-vis all the varying levels of teaching pragmatics, the participants felt unsuccessful and unpleased to teach pragmatic features because they find it difficult to transform their pragmatic knowledge to practice. Furthermore, they referred their inability to teach pragmatics and to be pragmatically unaware mainly to the lack of practice/training and the lack of raising their awareness about such issues while they have been actually taught as exemplified by one of them: *"we had no instruction to whatever when we've been taught TEFL about how to teach and integrate pragmatic features into our lessons."*

Given this, one of the participants highlighted, *"pragmatics is a challenging field either for teaching or learning it as well…it requires different skills and considerable abilities."* And correspondingly he recommended: *"There are a suggested solution for making this field interesting like bringing authentic situation, simplifying it to your students and motivate them as well."*

Accordingly, the participants perhaps would able to teach the pragmatic knowledge and translate it into practical applications at any level *"if they strengthen their knowledge about the pragmatical aspects."* as mentioned earlier by one of the participants. Because *"As future teacher, they still have to explore pragmatics and to get more knowledge in order to be able to teach pragmatics and in effective way."* as declared by another participant.

6.5 The Respondents' Awareness of the Different Teaching Approaches of Pragmatics in the EFL Classroom

There was a discrepancy between the responses made by the participants in terms of the teaching approaches of pragmatics in the EFL Classroom. Thirty-seven (41%) out of the 90 participants in the reflection papers did not provide any answer. Furthermore, few of them 8 (9%) reported a positive reflective comment concerning the teaching approaches of pragmatics where generally 4 out of them stated the following names: Task Based Approach, Competency Based Approach, Communicative Based Approach.

Yet, the remaining four respondents have a limited knowledge about the teaching approaches of pragmatics and/or not sure about their answers as they commented respectively:

"I know just the CBA approach of teaching pragmatics in EFL classroom."
"The teaching approach that I know is CBA (competency-based approach)."
"I don't really know the teaching approaches of pragmatics in the EFL classroom but I think communicative approaches are useful to apply."

Similarly, another participant reflected, *"I don't really know the different approaches of pragmatics in the EFL classroom but I think that CBA (competency-based approach) is one of them."*

By contrast, the majority of the respondents 45 (50%), in their reflection papers, replied negatively and declared their failure to mention any teaching approach of pragmatics in the EFL classroom. In this context a participant affirmed, *"I honestly confess my failure to name some pragmatic approaches in teaching English."*

Alike other participants holding the same view, their responses were presented respectively below:

"Honestly speaking, I don't know the different teaching approaches of pragmatics in EFL classroom."
"I don't have any idea about teaching approaches of pragmatics."
"I, unfortunately, don't have any teaching approaches of pragmatics in EFL classroom."
"No, I'm not aware of the different teaching approaches of pragmatics."

Furthermore, three of the comments on the approaches of pragmatics are as follows:
"We didn't study the different teaching approaches of pragmatics in the EFL classroom; thus I have no idea what are they."
"For teaching approaches of pragmatics, there is no idea from our learning experience since this issue is ignored in our classes."
"About the approaches I have never heard about them during two years of studying pragmatics."

So, through the above stated declarations, it is noticed that the participants as future teachers seem to lack the awareness of the different teaching approaches of pragmatics in particular and the awareness of pragmatic knowledge in general.

To practically support the results of the reflection papers, the participating prospective trainees (n=90) were requested to choose a pragmatic feature to teach it and design a pragmatically-focused lesson plan to be evaluated and to test how do they put their pragmatic knowledge into practice as the second phase of this study.

In fact, evaluation of pragmatic ability can be through traditional tests (which are usually quantified measures for summative assessment) or through performance tasks (commonly used for formative assessment, involving real-world tasks). The performance tasks are often assessed by using a checklist (showing whether or not learners addressed some criteria, as pointed by Tedick, 2002 as cited in Ishihara & Cohen, 2010) or following

a rubric (i.e., indicating the extent to which particular criteria should be achieved) which is the case of this study.

Accordingly, as shown below, the subjects' pragmatics lesson plan practices were analyzed by using the Ishihara & Cohen's (ibid, p.191) assessing rubric framework of the pragmatics lesson plan.

Table 1. The plan provides a specific pragmatic feature to be taught and empirical information is utilized to describe it.

Criteria for self-evaluation	Self-evaluation			
	Needs more work	Fair	Good	Excellent
	13%	54%	26%	7%

It is understood, based on this criterion, that only very few of the prospective teachers 6 (7%) were successful in planning and practicing a pragmatics-focused lesson. Alike 23 (26%) were good in their planning since they, generally, determined what a pragmatic feature is. However, 49 (54%) among the participants their plans were just fair as their way of presenting it was implicit and not clear, and 12 (13%) of them need more work because no empirical information was given, at all, and the teaching focus was on irrelevant elements instead such as plurality form, present and simple past (grammar).

Table 2. The description of the background is clear and complete.

Criteria for self-evaluation	Self-evaluation			
	Needs more work	Fair	Good	Excellent
	76%	24%	0%	0%

Among the 90 Participants, there were neither excellent (0%) nor good (0%) clear and complete description of the background was provided. In contrast, it was noticed that the percentage of 68 (76%) participants whose description needs more work was much greater than compared to those whose answers were fair 22 (24%). This implies that they are not acquainted the essential elements and steps that should be included and followed respectively in doing so (age, level, objectives, suggested time and setting, skill focus, target audience, target language and target culture, materials, resources, instructions and directions), or they know some of them but they are not able to develop a full description.

Table 3. The specific goals of the lesson (both pragmalinguistic and sociolinguistic) are realistic and appropriate for the context of the lesson, the students' age, educational backgrounds, and needs.

Criteria for self-evaluation	Self-evaluation			
	Needs more work	Fair	Good	Excellent
	56%	21%	16%	8%

The results of statement 3 show that the respondents' goals ((both pragmalinguistic and sociolinguistic) of those excellent 7 (8%) and good 14 (16%) were clear and well defined with different degrees. Meanwhile, those

of fair 19 (21%) a less attention was given to the sociopragmatic goal (exactly the contextual factors). In the same line, 50 (56%) of them need to work more on their pragmalinguistic and sociolinguistic goals as they were neither clear nor well defined for example one the participants suggested a specific goal of his lesson to teach the three types of acts: locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary in the speech acts to the third-year middle school students which is not suitable for their age and level. This denotes that the subjects are not aware of the importance of matching such criteria, as mentioned above in the table, to the pragmatic knowledge they should concentrate on when designing a pragmatically-focused plan.

Table 4. The time frame and choice of materials are appropriate for the lesson objectives (and the target audience).

Criteria for self-evaluation	Self-evaluation			
	Needs more work	Fair	Good	Excellent
	50%	26%	24%	0%

Statement 4 was given to measure time frame and to determine the choice of materials whether they are appropriate or not. More specifically, no excellent (0%) work was provided and only 22 (24%) of the respondents represented the good work and 23 (26%) of them represented the fair one. Contrariwise, 45 (50%) of them were totally oblivious about the importance of using authentic materials and the suitable time frame as one the participants did. Instead of giving 90 minutes or less, he suggested 120 minutes which does not match his work in general and does not go with his lesson objectives in particular.

Table 5. The lesson procedures are described in detail and follow a logical and realistic progression.

Criteria for self-evaluation	Self-evaluation			
	Needs more work	Fair	Good	Excellent
	27%	29%	36%	8%

Statement 5 examined the detailed description, logical and realistic progression of the lesson procedures. As can be seen from the table, 7 (8%) of the participants were excellent and 32 (36%) were good. However, 26 (29%) of them were fair and 25 (27%) of them need to develop their works more, at the level of lesson procedures, since they either missed one or more of the strategic steps: warm up, presentation, following up or they did not even take them into account while designing their whole lesson plan.

Table 6. The rational for the instructional decisions is clearly explained and informed by course discussions.

Criteria for self-evaluation	Self-evaluation			
	Needs more work	Fair	Good	Excellent
	74%	22%	4%	0%

As table 6 demonstrates, no one of the participants has given an excellent (0%) clearly explained informed rational and only 3 (4%) were good at doing that. On the other hand, 20 (22%) of them were fair because their justifications were not cogent enough. In the same vein, it is worth noting that the majority of the participants 67 (74%) did not make any justification about their instructional decisions.

Table 7. The pragmatics material is largely research-based and the language samples are authentic.

Criteria for self-evaluation	Self-evaluation			
	Needs more work	Fair	Good	Excellent
	72%	20%	6%	2%

The participants' use of largely research-based pragmatics material and authentic language samples were explored through their applied works to statement 7. As shown in the table above, 2 (2%) and 5 (6%) of the participants were excellent and good respectively in doing so. However, 18 (20%) of them were fair and the majority of them 65 (72%) used unauthentic sources such as: handouts, textbooks instead of using the authentic ones for instance: videos, audios. This indicates that more than a half of the total number of the participants were not aware of the good choice of the appropriate source and how the pragmatics material should be.

Table 8. The tasks trigger learners' awareness of pragmatics in a meaningful context and explicitly facilitate an under- standing of the relationship between context and form.

Criteria for self-evaluation	Self-evaluation			
	Needs more work	Fair	Good	Excellent
	52%	35%	12%	1%

As seen from table 8 only 1 (1%) of the respondents who realized an excellent task and 11 (12%) of them were good in which they focused on both form and context as well as they indicated to teach the linguistic expressions in relation to the contextual factors. Yet, 31 (35%) of the participants' tasks were fair as their focus was only on form rather than context. More importantly, 47 (52%) of them did not include any task. This percentage demonstrated the need for the prospective teachers to be self-aware of inserting tasks that aim to raise the learners' awareness of pragmatics.

Table 9. The activities provide sufficient and effective language input and/or elicit interactive output to achieve the content objectives.

Criteria for self-evaluation	Self-evaluation			
	Needs more work	Fair	Good	Excellent
	44%	51%	5%	0%

As table 9 displays, it can be observed that no excellent (0%) activities were provided by the participants and only 4 (5%) were good. In the same regard, 46 (51%) of the participants' activities were fair and 40 (44%) of them

need to work more and more as their activities were not suitable for the lesson
objectives and did not elicit students' output. Also, their input was not rich
enough for students in order to produce output related to the content
objectives.

Table 10. The assessment and feedback procedures are well-suited to the
lesson and are based on learners' goals and intentions.

Criteria for self-evaluation	Self-evaluation			
	Needs more work	Fair	Good	Excellent
	60%	32%	8%	0%

The results given above in table 10 showed that among the
participants, no one reported an excellent (0%) assessment and feedback
procedures, followed by 7 (8%) of them were good. However, 29 (32%) were
fair as they did it implicitly. Moreover, the remaining proportion was rated
first as no assessment and feedback procedures were followed; thus, the data
revealed that among all the total number of respondents 90, 54 (60%) of them,
representing the majority, need to work more in terms of stating the
assessment and feedback procedures that are compatible to the lesson and
based on learners' goals and intentions.

Table 11. The lesson plan includes accurate references and well-designed
classroom resources and materials.

Criteria for self-evaluation	Self-evaluation			
	Needs more work	Fair	Good	Excellent
	50%	27%	18%	5%

With respect to the last criterion, data yielded from statement 11 were
presented and used to examine if the lesson plan includes accurate references
and well-designed classroom resources and materials or not. The findings
revealed that just 4 (5%) of the participants were excellent and few of them
16 (18%) were good as they used accurate references and authentic materials.
Contrariwise, 25 (27%) of them were fair as they based only on textbook
writers' intuition in which the language used is schoolish and stilted.
Furthermore, it was remarkable the majority of the participants 45 (50%)
reported a lack of including references, supplementary resources and
authentic materials.

7. Conclusions

This section provides the main findings of the present study based
on the participants' reflection papers and their lesson plans. Generally, the
gathered data illustrated that the participants' pragmatic awareness seems to
remain at the theoretical level and it is characterized as rather timid or even
limited to a large extent. Based on the analysis of both instruments: reflection
papers and lesson plan, the following discussed outcomes related to Master's
TEFL prospective teachers' pragmatic awareness, their reflections on
pragmatic knowledge and their practices to lesson plan are postulated infra:

- Prospective teachers articulated that they have weaknesses more than strengths, to a great extent, as regards pragmatics.
- They lack pragmatic awareness of the target language and they find it difficult to put their pragmatic knowledge into practice.
- They hold a negative attitude about the pragmatic course they had at university in general and its teaching method in particular reporting that having a theoretical rather than an applied orientation.
- They are not aware of the pragmatic features that should be taught in an EFL classroom and they are not able to teach what they have learnt from the previous pragmatic course.
- Almost of the prospective teachers participated in this study seem to be unaware of the different teaching pragmatic approaches in the EFL classroom which is in turn indicate that they lack the pragmatic knowledge and the pragmatic awareness.
- A modest performance in planning and practicing a pragmatics-focused lesson plan as the participants displayed their inability to plan and design a pragmatically-focused lesson plan and transfer their pragmatic knowledge into practical applications. Very few of them were able to certain extent to do so.
- Most of the participants not only acknowledged the need for more background information and practical knowledge in order to know how to teach pragmatics in the EFL context, but also showed interest and enthusiasm for this aspect of language teaching. For one participant, learning about teaching pragmatics became very important: As indicated before, in the section of reflection papers' analysis, by one of the participants: *I need to learn more about it to improve my awareness about this strategy or about pragmatics."*

To sum up, though awareness of pragmatic knowledge and its application in language teaching is significant for language teachers and crucial part in classroom practices, the language prospective teachers in Setif-2 university are not equipped well with pragmatic competence for successful cross-cultural communications. Considering the fact that knowledge of pragmatics is not sufficient for teaching pragmatics; the instructional pragmatics should be included to ensure the learner comprehension (Eslami, Ishihara, Vásquez & Vellenga 2010). This indicates the importance and necessity of instructional pragmatics in EFL. Accordingly, both pragmatic knowledge and pragmatic awareness must be mastered by the language teachers particularly and learners generally and because teaching pragmatics include a number of challenges, weaknesses as it is acknowledged by the prospective teachers (Eslami-Rasekh, 2005; Vasquez & Sharpless, 2009). Thus, to facilitate the process of pragmatic development and assist the participants in enhancing their awareness of the related issues to pragmatics-focused plan and embody it effectively, participant collaborators could be invited to go through each other's lesson plan by following a collegial collaboration and using Ishihara's assessment list (see Appendix C) and to

comment on the features that they perceive to be planned well, along with those that need further improvement. Furthermore, participants should be supported to be aware of pragmatic challenges of the target language and the importance of developing their pragmatic competence.

As a conclusion, the present study seeks to investigate and explore the prospective teachers' pragmatic awareness and their reflections on pragmatic knowledge and practices in the EFL classroom with regard to their pragmatic applications while designing their lesson plans. The comments gathered from the reflection papers and the results of the lesson plan, in general, revealed that the participants have a limited pragmatic awareness; however, their awareness was mostly theoretical. While their lesson plans were analyzed, it was clearly perceived that the M1 prospective teachers could not perform well in practical applications of their pragmatic knowledge. Their reflective comments and the lesson plans resulted in similar negative findings. All in all, this research triggers insights for more practical pragmatic instruction and suggestions for curriculum development dedicated to EFL learners and teachers.

5. Bibliography List:

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

Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001) Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics? In K. R. Rose and G. Kasper (eds), *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 13–32.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Mahan-Taylor, R. (2003). *Teaching pragmatics* [Online]. Retrieved from http://exchanges.state.gov/education/engteaching/pragmatics_htm

Biesenbach-Lucas, S. (2003). Preparing students for the pragmatics of e-mail interaction in academia: A new/forgotten dimension in teacher education. *Teacher Education Interest Section Newsletter, 18*(2), 3-4.

Boud, D., Keogh, R., & Walker, D. (1985). *Reflection*: Turning experience into learning. London, UK: Kogan page.

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

Cohen, A. (2005). Strategies for learning and Performing L2 speech acts. *Intercultural Pragmatics,* 2-3, 275-301.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think*: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the education process. Boston, MA: D. C. Health.

Eslami, Z. R. (2005). Raising the pragmatic awareness of language learners. *ELT Journal, 59*, 199–208.Rose, K. R. (1997). Pragmatics in teacher education for nonnative-speaking teachers: A consciousness-raising approach. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 10*(2), 125 138.

Eslami, Z. R. (2010). In their own voices: Reflections of native and nonnative English speaking TESOL graduate students on on-line pragmatic instruction to EFL learners. Paper presented at the Pragmatics and Language Learning Conference, Kobe, Japan.

Eslami, Z. R., & Eslami-Rasekh, A. (2008). Enhancing the pragmatic competence of nonnative English-speaking teacher candidates (NNESTCs). In E. S. Alcón & A. Martínez-Flor (Eds.), *Investigating pragmatics in foreign language*

learning, teaching, and testing (pp. 178-197). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Fogarty, R. (1994). *Teach for metacognitive reflection*. Arlington Heights, IL: IRI/Sky Light Training and Publishing.

Glaser, K. (2014). *Inductive or deductive?: The impact of method of instruction on the acquisition of pragmatic competence in EFL*. Cambridge scholars publishing.

Hay, A., Peltier, J. W., & Drago, W. A. (2004). Reflective learning and on-line management education: A comparison of traditional and on-line MBA students. *Strategic Change*, 13(4), 169-82.

Hergüner, S., & Çakır, A., (2017). Determining the level of pragmatic awareness of ELT teacher trainees: A study of refusals of requests. *Journal of Human Sciences, 14* (2), 1517-1533. doi:10.14687/jhs. v14i2.4575

Huang, L. Sh. (2012). Use of Oral Reflection in Facilitating Graduate EAL Students' Oral-Language Production and Strategy Use: An Empirical Action Research Study. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*: Vol. 6: No. 2, Article 27. Available at: https://doi.org/10.20429/ijsotl.2012.060227

Ishihara N. (2010). Assessment of Pragmatics in the classroom. In N. Ishihara & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), *Teaching and Learning Pragmatics: Where Language and Culture Meet* (286-317). Malaysia: Pearson Education.

Ishihara, N & Cohen, A.D. (2010). *Teaching and Learning Pragmatics*: Where language and culture meet. Harlow, UK: Pearson Longman.

Ishihara, N. (2007). Web---based curriculum for pragmatics instruction in Japanese as a foreign language: An explicit awareness---raising approach. *Language Awareness*, *16*, 1, 21-40.

Ishihara, N. (2011). Co-constructing pragmatic awareness: Instructional pragmatics in EFL teacher development in Japan. *TESL--EJ, 15 (2).*

Kasper, G. (2001) Four perspectives on L2 pragmatic development. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(4), 502–30.

Kember, D., Jones, A., Loke, A., McKay, J., Sinclair, K., Tse, H., Webb, C., Wong, G., Wong, M., & Yeung, E. (1999). Determining the level of reflective thinking from students' written journals using a coding scheme based on the work of Mezirow, *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 18(1), 18-30.

Kember, D., Leung, D. Y. P., Jones, A., Loke, A., KcKay, J., Sinclair, K., Tse, H., Webb, C., Wong, F. K. Y., Wong, M., & Yeung, E. (2000). Development of a questionnaire to measure the level of reflective thinking. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 25(4), 381- 395.

Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning*: Experience as the source of learning and development. Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Langer, E. J. (1997). *The power of mindful learning*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing.

Meier, A. J. (2003). Posting the banns: A marriage of pragmatics and culture in foreign and second language pedagogy and beyond. In A. Martínez, E. Usó, and A. Fernández (eds), *Pragmatic competence and foreign*

Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: JosseyBass.

Mochizuki, A. (Ed.) (2010). *Shin gakushu shido youkoni motoduku eigoka kyouikuho* [English language teaching methods based on the revised Course of Study]. Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten.

Pasternak, M., & Bailey, K. (2004). Preparing nonnative and native English-speaking Teachers: Issues of professionalism and proficiency. In L. Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and teaching from experience* (pp. 155-176). Ann Arbor. MI: University of Michigan Press.

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

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1–22.

Tsuchiya, S. & Hirono, T. (2008). *Shin eigoka kyoikuho nyumon* [Revised introduction to English language teaching methods]. Tokyo: Kenkusha.

Vásquez, C. (2010). Teacher education and L2 pragmatics: Limitless possibilities. Paper presented at the Pragmatics and Language Learning Conference, Kobe, Japan.

Vásquez, C., & Fioramonte, A. (2011). Integrating Pragmatics into the MA-TESL Program: Perspectives from Former Students. *Tesl-Ej*, *15*(2), n2.

Vásquez, 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.

Vellenga, H. (2010). Teaching L2 pragmatics across a language curriculum: Ways to incorporate direct instruction. Paper presented at the Pragmatics and Language Learning Conference, Kobe, Japan.

Yates, L. & Wigglesworth, G. (2005). Researching the effectiveness of professional development in pragmatics. In Bartels, N.(ed). *Applied Linguistics in Language Teacher Education,* (pp. 261---280). New York, NY: Springer.

6. Appendices

<div align="center">Appendix A</div>
<div align="center">Reflection Paper</div>

You are kindly requested to write a reflection paper about:

1) Your strengths and weaknesses as regards pragmatics.

2) You may add your evaluation of the pragmatics course that you had at the university and how it is taught.

(N.B. For teachers who graduated from the classical system, did you learn any aspect about pragmatics, which is the study of language use in communication, i.e., in a context, during your graduation level?)

3) Do you think that you have enough pragmatic knowledge about the English language?

4) Are you able to teach the pragmatic knowledge at any level (middle school, secondary school, private school, ESP)?

5) Do you know the different teaching approaches of pragmatics in the EFL classroom?

<div align="center">Appendix B</div>
<div align="center">Lesson Plan</div>

• Choose any pragmatic feature to teach it and design a pragmatically-focused lesson plan.

……………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………

<div align="right">Thank you for your participation.</div>

Appendix C
Rubric for Self-Assessing the Pragmatics Lesson Plan
by Ishihara & Cohen's (2010)

Criteria for self-evaluation	*Self-evaluation*		
The plan provides a specific feature of pragmatics to be taught.	Excellent	Good	Needs more work
Learner characteristics match the choice of the feature of pragmatics to be taught and the overall goal of the lesson.	Excellent	Good	Needs more work
The content objectives for pragmatics are realistic and appropriate for the students' age, educational backgrounds, and needs.	Excellent	Good	Needs more work
The language objectives are meaningful and appropriate in the context of the lesson.	Excellent	Good	Needs more work
The cultural awareness objectives are meaningful and match the overall content objectives for pragmatics.	Excellent	Good	Needs more work
The time frame and choice of materials are appropriate for the lesson objectives and the target audience.	Excellent	Good	Needs more work
The lesson procedures follow a logical and realistic progression.	Excellent	Good	Needs more work
The pragmatics material is largely research-based and the language samples are authentic.	Excellent	Good	Needs more work
The tasks trigger learners' awareness of pragmatics in a meaningful context and explicitly facilitate an understanding of the relationship between context and form.	Excellent	Good	Needs more work
The activities provide sufficient and effective language input and/or elicit interactive output to achieve the objectives.	Excellent	Good	Needs more work
The assessment and feedback procedures are well-suited to the lesson and are based on learners' goals and intentions (see Chapter 15).	Excellent	Good	Needs more work