AN INVESTIGATION INTO GRAMMATICAL AND PRAGMATIC AWARENESS OF PROSPECTIVE ENGLISH TEACHERS

Devrim HÖL
Asst. Prof. Dr., Pamukkale University, Denizli, Turkey, devrimh@pau.edu.tr
ORCID: 0000-0001-5151-2581

Şerife AYGÜN
PhD student, Pamukkale University, Denizli, Turkey, serifeaygun@gmail.com
ORCID: 0009-0002-5089-8798

ABSTRACT

The main goal of this study is to investigate the perceived degree of grammatical and pragmatic awareness of the freshman and senior students at English Language Teaching (ELT) Department. With this aim, the participants were chosen randomly from freshman (N=26) and senior (N=22) students. This study adopted a quantitative research design by gathering data from discourse completion tasks (DCT) involving twenty different discourse completion tasks and scenarios including four speech acts: requests, apologies, suggestions, and refusals. Firstly, Shapiro-Wilk test was used to test the normality. Secondly, Mann-Whitney U tests were run for the data analysis of DCT . Thirdly, to compare two groups, which are freshmen and senior students in this study, and to discover the degree of awareness in grammar and pragmatics as well as perceptions for the severity of errors in DCT scenarios in two groups, Spearman's rho test of correlation was conducted. The statistical findings revealed that there is no significant difference between freshman and senior students with respect to their degree of grammatical and pragmatic awareness. However, students were found to have significantly higher degree of pragmatic awareness than grammatical awareness. In addition, students rated pragmatic errors as more severe than the grammatical ones. These findings might be related with the ELT curriculum. The courses they take such as Oral Communication Skills and World Englishes and Culture might have raised their pragmatic awareness and shifted their focus from grammar towards communicative and pragmatic aspect of language. The overall results of the study has a number of pedagogical implications for language learning and teaching.

Keywords: Pragmatic competence, pragmatic awareness, grammatical awareness, English language teaching

INTRODUCTION

Globalization has changed the conditions under which foreign languages (FLs) are taught, studied, and used due to the increased mobility of people and money, global technology, and global information networks (Kramsch, 2014), which resulted in increasingly linguistically diverse populations all over the world. Thus, in today's globalized society, language has a significant role for communication. In accordance with the global shifts, the ways languages are learnt and taught have also changed (Block & Cameron, 2001). In other words, it has challenged the way teachers traditionally rely on to help students become competent language users after they leave the classroom. These shifts call for a more reflective, interpretive, historically grounded, and politically engaged pedagogy than communicative language teaching did in the 1980s (Kramsch, 2014) by challenging the static view of language learning and teaching process. These two challenging views of language learning can be described with reference to the terms 'Representationalism' and 'New Materialism'. The concept of 'new materialism' involves certain interactions that necessitate the incorporation of ethical values such as collaboration, solidarity, and patience when dealing with diversity and achieving effective communication, as stated by Canagarajah (2021). Additionally, pragmatic competence, which is characterized as the capability to utilize language proficiently in social circumstances, as explained by Taguchi (2009), is also crucial in such interactions. However, language teaching in the past primarily focused on instructing grammar and generating precise sentences, with a focus on sentence-level issues rather than pragmatic considerations (Ohta, 2008). According to Hymes, language proficiency encompasses more than simply using correct grammar; it entails understanding how language is used in various contexts and being able to employ it appropriately. This broader skill set is referred to as 'communicative competence'. (1972). Since then, a wide range of communicative competence models have been proposed and evolved into new models with new components. Canale and Swain (1980) expanded upon Hymes' communicative competence model in the 1980s, which originally comprised linguistic and sociolinguistic competences, by integrating strategic competence into sociolinguistic competences. Besides, Canale later augmented this framework in 1983 by including discourse competence as another vital component of communicative competence. During the 1990s, Celce-Murcia and her colleagues (1995) expanded upon Canale's communicative competence model by introducing a new component, actional competence, to the previously established sociolinguistic competence. As per this model, communicative competence is comprised of linguistic, strategic, sociolinguistic, and actional competences in addition to discourse competence (Celce-Murcia, 2008). All of these models show the shift of focus on the notion of language competence through inclusion of different interrelated competences from linguistic competence towards strategic, sociolinguistic, actional, and discourse competence. In addition to these models, Bachman (1990) introduced another language proficiency model adding new components. Bachman's model of language competence (1990) comprises two main subcomponents: organizational and pragmatic competence. The former pertains to linguistic knowledge and is further divided into grammatical and textual competence. The latter, referred to as pragmatic competence, encompasses illocutionary and sociolinguistic competences and can be described as the capability to produce acceptable utterances within particular contexts of language usage, while also adhering to the rules that govern the effective use of language in specific situations (Fulcher & Davidson, 2007, p.44). Illocutionary

competence is a subcomponent of pragmatic competence that focuses on language functions and speech acts (based on Austin, 1962, as cited in Fulcher & Davidson, 2007, p.44). The various functions of language were categorized into seven different types The first function is ideational, which involves the expression of propositions, information, or feelings. The second function is manipulative, which refers to the use of language to affect the world around us. The third function, instrumental, is related to the use of speech acts to achieve goals. The fourth function is regulatory, which deals with controlling the behavior of others through language. The fifth function, interactional, pertains to managing interpersonal relationships. The sixth function is heuristic, which involves extending our knowledge of the world through language. Finally, the seventh function is imaginative, which involves using language for humorous or aesthetic purposes. The various functions of language were categorized into seven different types by Halliday(1973). The first function is ideational, which involves the expression of propositions, information, or feelings. The second function is manipulative, which refers to the use of language to affect the world around us. The third function, instrumental, is related to the use of speech acts to achieve goals. The fourth function is regulatory, which deals with controlling the behavior of others through language. The fifth function, interactional, pertains to managing interpersonal relationships. The sixth function is heuristic, which involves extending our knowledge of the world through language. Finally, the seventh function is imaginative, which involves using language for humorous or aesthetic purposes (Fulcher & Davidson, 2007).

In short, pragmatic competence can be defined as "the ability to communicate your intended message with all its nuances in any socio-cultural context and to interpret the message of your interlocutor as it was intended" (Fraser, 2010, p. 15). Therefore, being aware all possible explanations of an intended message is very important cognition to prevent pragmatic failure and miscommunication in a socio-cultural context. In other words, lack of pragmatic competence can be resulted in "cross-cultural miscommunication or cultural stereotyping with long-term consequences" (Taguchi & Syke, 2013, p. 1). The development of pragmatic competence and awareness is necessary for successful communication in intercultural and multicultural settings. Thus, many studies have been conducted to explore the different relationships between language learning/teaching and developing pragmatic competence with different participants, instruments, and purposes. For example, the study of Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei (1998) is one of the most influential studies, which was replicated by many researchers. The data collection instrument used in this study was also developed and used by Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei's study (1998). In line with the aim and the main instrument of this study, replicated studies of Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei (1998) were reviewed since data gathered from the same instrument can make statistical and qualitative comparisons more comprehensible.

Studies on the Grammatical and Pragmatic Awareness in EFL and ESL Contexts Abroad

Explicit grammar teaching has been shown in studies to improve grammatical awareness in EFL/ESL learners (Borg, 2010; Ellis, 2006; Nassaji & Fotos, 2011). Some researchers, however, contend that implicit instruction through exposure to input is just as efficient (Doughty & Williams, 1998; VanPatten & Oikkenon, 1996).

Furthermore, studies have shown that learners' grammatical awareness varies based on their L1 and language learning experience (Gass & Selinker, 2008; Kasper & Rose, 2001; Sharwood-Smith, 1993). EFL/ESL learners who have a background in a language with comparable grammatical structures to the target language, for example, may find it simpler to acquire grammatical awareness (Housen & Simoens, 2016). In EFL/ESL settings, pragmatic awareness is frequently regarded as more difficult than grammatical awareness (Bardovi-Harlig & Bastos, 2011; Kasper & Rose, 2001). Explicit instruction has been shown in studies to improve pragmatic awareness; however, it must be contextualized and focused on particular aspects of pragmatics (Bardovi-Harlig & Dörnyei, 1998; Kasper & Rose, 2002; Taguchi & Roever, 2017). Furthermore, cultural dimensions such as the amount of directness or politeness used in various cultures can impact learners' awareness of pragmatics (Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989; Gu, 1990). Even though grammatical and pragmatic awareness are separate concepts in language acquisition, they are closely related (Ellis, 2003; Hinkel, 2006). According to some research, explicit instruction in both grammar and pragmatics can improve language learning results (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Schmidt & Frota, 1986). Nevertheless, other research has found that combining explicit grammar and pragmatic teaching can be exhausting for learners, necessitating a more balanced approach (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; Robinson, 1995). One of the most eminent research on grammatical and pragmatic awareness was carried out by Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei (1998). The study was conducted to find out the degree of grammatical and pragmatic awareness of instructed L2 learners of English comparing EFL and ESL learners. The subjects were 543 learners and their teachers (N = 53) in two different countries, namely Hungary and US. Besides, a secondary sample of 112 EFL speakers in Italy also participated in the study. A videotape with 20 scenarios was used as the instrument of the research. The results revealed that both EFL learners and their teachers found out and rated grammatical errors more serious than the pragmatic ones. On the other hand, ESL learners and their teachers ranked pragmatic errors as more serious than the grammatical ones. One possible explanation for such a difference were stated as residency and intensity of their exposure to English. The second possible reason might be the negative washback effect of language exams focusing on linguistic forms. It was claimed that EFL learners might be unaware of the differences between their interlanguage pragmatics and L2 pragmatics. As a pedagogical implication, awareness-raising and noticing activities are suggested to be provided while introducing pragmatic input. Niezgoda and Röver (2001) conducted a replication study of Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei (1998) with the same data collection tools. The subjects of the study were both EFL learners from Czech Republic and ESL learners from Hawaii. In contrast to the findings of Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei's study (1998), the EFL learners identified a higher number of pragmatic errors than the ESL learners. However, in line with the findings of the original study, ESL learners rated pragmatic errors more serious than grammatical ones. Similar to the research of Niezgoda and Röver (2001), Schauer (2006) also replicated Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei's study (1998) with EFL students from Germany and ESL students from British University and also British native speakers. As for data collection, the same Discourse Completion Task (DCT) and semi-structured interviews were used. In line with the findings of Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei's study (1998), ESL learners were able to find out more pragmatic errors than the EFL learners. However, this finding is in contrast with the Niezgoda and Röver's findings (2001) since EFL learners found out more pragmatic errors in their study. As in Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei's (1998) and

Niezgoda and Röver's (2001) study, participants from ESL context perceived pragmatically inappropriate scenarios more seriously than grammatically incorrect ones. Besides, EFL students also rated grammatically problematic scenarios more serious than the pragmatically inappropriate ones as in Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei's (1998) study.

In conclusion, all of these studies revealed that EFL students' degree of grammatical awareness, in general, is higher than that of ESL students. However, regarding their pragmatic awareness, EFL students' degree of pragmatic awareness is lower than that of ESL learners.

Studies on the Grammatical and Pragmatic Awareness in EFL and ESL Contexts in Turkey

In the Turkish EFL context, there has been a limited amount of research conducted to evaluate the pragmatic skills of EFL students through their speech acts. To the best of authors' knowledge, only two studies have been undertaken that compare the degree of grammatical and pragmatic awareness of Turkish EFL learners in Turkish EFL context. One of these studies was carried out by Tulgar (2016) with 554 EFL learners and 50 faculty members from six state universities in Turkey. The main purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions, attitudes, and self-evaluations of EFL learners and faculty members with respect to teaching and evaluating pragmatic competence in foreign language education. The data were collected both quantitatively and qualitatively. The data collection instruments were a DCT, a questionnaire, and six open-ended questions. The questionnaire was filled out by faculty members while the six open-ended questions were answered by both student and their teachers. The DCT results showed that pragmatic appropriateness was 2.78 while it is 4.36 for grammatical appropriateness, which showed that language students' levels of pragmatic competence are lower than their grammatical competence. However, no significant difference was found between their perceptions about the severity of pragmatic and grammatical errors. With respect to the grades of participants, no significant differences among grades (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior ELT students) were found regarding their pragmatic appropriateness, grammatical appropriateness, pragmatic severity, grammatical severity and control scores (p>0.05). The qualitative results, on the other hand, revealed that almost all of the participants believe that pragmatics instruction and pragmatic assessment are an important part of foreign language education and language competence. However, they stated that there are some problems in teaching -testing pragmatic competence due to "the existing education system, examination style, the way of language instruction, general language proficiency of students, their attitudes, low levels of motivation and sometimes their indifference as well as instructors' teaching style, their level of L2 proficiency and teaching abilities". However, pragmatic competence was considered to be an indispensable part of language education

Another replication study was conducted by Kaplan (2019) with 50 high intermediate preparatory school students from different departments. The main purpose of the study was to investigate the pragmatic and grammatical awareness level of preparatory school students. The data collection tools of the study were a Discourse Completion Task (DCT) including 20 scenarios about different speech acts and focus group interviews.

The results showed that prep school EFL learners' degree of pragmatic awareness level is higher than their grammatical awareness level. The focus group interviews suggested that the result was related with students' attitude towards grammar knowledge. They do not think that grammatical knowledge is a prerequisite for foreign language competence. Thus, the degree of their grammatical awareness is lower than that of pragmatic awareness.

The overall study results in Turkish EFL context show that despite its importance in communication, pragmatic competence can be sometimes overshadowed by overemphasis on grammar in foreign language classrooms. For instance, teaching use of third-person singular -s receives considerable attention in most of the foreign language classrooms while pragmatic failure often ignored or was attributed to another reason such as rudeness of the student (Thomas, 1983). As for Turkish EFL context, the reasons for why students are unable to speak in English despite years of studying it still remains as an open question. Some students and teachers attribute this failure to grammar-focused English lessons while others highlight the mismatch between the English they learn in classrooms and the one they hear while listening to songs, watching movies, and other authentic materials. A second reason might also be "…pedagogical focus on grammatical competence (i.e., accuracy) in L2 classrooms, which might implicitly indicate "certain priorities to the students and thus might encourage grammatical competency at the expense of other competencies" (Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1996). Therefore, this study aims to investigate whether there is a significant difference between grammatical and pragmatical awareness of prospective teachers studying at English Language Teaching (ELT) department at entry (freshman) and graduation (senior) level. Tulgar (2016) found no significant difference among different grades of ELT students regarding their pragmatic appropriateness, grammatical appropriateness, pragmatic severity, grammatical severity and control scores. However, Tulgar (2016) suggested for further research that the context of investigation can be expanded to other universities in order to collect more comprehensive data and get more detailed understanding of the issue and generalize the findings. Following these suggestions, this study is expected to contribute to the field by being second after Tulgar's study (2016) to compare the freshman and senior students with respect to grammatical and pragmatic awareness in Turkish EFL context since these two groups of students might serve like a bridge between high school English education in mainstream schools and university education for teaching English. In other words, Freshman might reflect their high school English background while seniors might reflect the outcomes of ELT education at university as the last graders. With this regard, the study seeks answers to the following research questions:

1. What is the freshman and senior ELT students' degree of awareness in grammar and pragmatics?

    a. Is there a significant difference among freshman and senior students with respect to their degree of awareness in grammar and pragmatics?

    b. Is there a significant difference with respect to their reported degrees of severity of the errors for the inappropriate and incorrect scenarios?

2. Is there a significant relationship between the degree of grammatical and pragmatic awareness of ELT students?

3. Is there a significant relationship between the ELT students' perceptions of the severity degree of grammatical and pragmatic errors?

METHOD

Research Design

Quantitative inquiry represents a method of research characterized by its systematic, rigorous, and well-defined approach. It involves precise measurements, generating reliable and replicable data that can be applied to various contexts. Moreover, it offers built-in mechanisms like statistical analyses to aid readers in evaluating the validity of the quantitative findings (Dörnyei, 2007). Since this study was designed as a replication study, a quantitative research design was adopted by gathering data from the results of the Discourse Completion Tasks (Bardovi-Harlig & Dörnyei, 1998). In addition, Taguchi (2018) suggests that utilizing quantitative studies can facilitate the investigation of how the pragmatic competence of second language (L2) learners evolves over time through systematic and cyclical data collection. Therefore, subjects in this study were asked whether they would like to participate in follow-up research as well as interview in order to expand the research into a longitudinal one in future studies. The ones who were voluntary to participate in follow-up research were asked to write down their contact information at the beginning of the study.

The normality of data in this study was tested through Shapiro-Wilk test. As a result, non-parametric tests were used since the normality of data differed significantly from one another in some of the items ($p<.05$). Mann-Whitney U tests, Descriptive Statistics, Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Tests, Spearman's rho correlation tests were also computed. Mann Whitney U tests were used to compare the mean scores of two groups of students with each other for each item in the DCT. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Tests and Descriptive Statistics were used to explore whether there is a statistically significant difference regarding overall mean scores for the pragmatic and grammatical degree of awareness of ELT students as well as their perceptions on the severity of the grammatical and pragmatic errors. In order to find out the reliability of the instrument, Cronbach alpha was calculated.

Participants

The participants of the study constituted a total of 48 students. Purposive and convenience sampling was adopted to compare the freshman and senior students' degree of grammatical and pragmatic awareness. As the participants of the study, there were 26 freshman and 22 senior students studying at English Language Teaching (ELT) department of a state university (Table 1). The students can be said to have similar levels of English proficiency since all of the students were placed into ELT department through the university language exam administered after high school in Turkey. The exam consists of 80 questions testing their vocabulary and grammar knowledge as well reading comprehension. After placed into ELT department of the university, the students are also administered a preparatory school English exam based on four skills by the university. Students

who fail to achieve the required score for passing the exam attend preparatory school for a year before starting the first grade.

Table 1. Demographic Details of the Participants

Age Range	Gender	Class	Attending Prep School	Native Language	Communicating in another language in family
18-25	Female(N=25)	Freshman(N=26)	Yes (N=15)	Turkish (N=1)	Yes(N=9)
	Male (N=23)	Senior(N=22)	No (N=33)	German(N=1)	No (N=39)

Data Collection Process

The ethical approval for the study was obtained with the decision the Social and Human Sciences Ethics Committee of Pamukkale University dated 24.04.2023 and numbered 68282350/2023/09. The data from the students were gathered at the end of the academic year in May through online version of the instruments created in Google Forms. Data collection process took two weeks.

Data Collection Instruments

As the instruments of the study, demographic information questions and DCT were used:

Demographic Information Questions

At the beginning of the study, the students were asked to provide demographic information about their age, gender, class and native language. They were also asked whether they attended preparatory school or speak another language other than English. In addition, the students who volunteered to participate in a follow up research were asked to write their contact information.

Discourse Completion Task (DCT)

The most popular data collection instrument in cross-cultural and interlanguage pragmatics is known as DCTs since they "provide learners with an opportunity for a display of knowledge that is precluded for many non-native speakers by the cognitive demands of face-to-face interaction". They can be used both for production of speech acts and testing the comprehension of speech acts (Yamashita, 2008). Therefore, in this study, a DCT was used in order to find out the degree of pragmatic and grammatical awareness of freshman and senior ELT students as well as their perceptions about the severity of The DCT . It was originally formed by Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei (1998) including 20 scenarios including four speech acts: requests, apologies, suggestions, and refusals. The task items included three categories as follows:

> (1) sentences that were pragmatically appropriate but grammatically incorrect (eight items),
> (2) sentences that were grammatically correct but pragmatically inappropriate (eight items),
> (3) sentences that were both grammatical and appropriate (four items).

Prior to the DCT, the students were provided with samples for each of the categories as follows (Bardovi-Harlig & Dörnyei, 1998):

Sample 1. Pragmatically Inappropriate Item

Anna: Good Morning, John.
!Peter: #GOOD NIGHT, EMMA.

Sample 2. Grammatically Incorrect Item

Emma was going to call Mary to invite the party, but she forgot it.
Anna: Hi Emma, did you invite the Mary to the party?
!Peter: I'm really sorry but I was so bust yesterday and I haven't *CALL her yet.

Sample 3. Appropriate/Correct Item

Maria invites her friend to her house, but she can't come.
Anna: Maria, would you like to come over this afternoon?
!Maria: I'm sorry, I'd really like to come, but I have a difficult history test tomorrow.

After each scenario, the students were asked two questions. In the first question, they were asked to judge whether the last sentence in the scenario grammatically correct/ pragmatically appropriate by circling either "yes" or "no". If they think that the sentence is grammatically incorrect/pragmatically inappropriate and circle yes, they were asked to rate the severity of the problem on a scale from not bad at all (1) and very bad (4). For a small mistake, they were told to mark the second or third slot; for a serious mistake to mark the last slot as follows:

> Was the last part appropriate/correct?   Yes   No
> If there was a problem, how bad do you think it was?
> Not bad at all (1) : (2) : (3) : (4) Very bad

As for the reliability of the DCT, the pragmatic and grammatical items were tested separately in the study conducted by Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei (1998). The Cronbach α internal consistency coefficients of these scales were found to be .72 and .77 respectively, which shows that the DCT is a reliable tool. Furthermore, Cronbach's Alpha and split-half coefficient reliability analyses for the DCT was also calculated by Tulgar (2016) for ELT students. The Cronbach's Alpha value was .73 and the split half coefficient value was .71, which proved a sufficient level of reliability value for the instrument. The Cronbach's Alpha value for this study was found out to be .72 for items testing grammatical awareness and .74 for the items testing pragmatic awareness.

FINDINGS

Quantitative data were collected through DCT including 20 scenarios. In order to test the normality distribution of data, Shapiro-Wilk normality test was used since the sample size is less than 50 (N=48). The results showed that there is a significant difference for all of the items in DCT regarding normality (p<.05). Hence, non-parametric tests were run for data analysis. The results of these tests will be presented in accordance with the research questions.

The Comparison of Freshman and Senior ELT students' Degree of Awareness in Grammar and Pragmatics

In order to answer the first research question, the results for DCT are presented according to the three subcategories as follows:

1. Sentences that were pragmatically appropriate but grammatically incorrect (eight items),
2. Sentences that were grammatically correct but pragmatically inappropriate (eight items),
3. Sentences that were both grammatical and appropriate (four items).

Pragmatically Appropriate but Grammatically Incorrect Items

In the DCT questionnaire, eight out of 20 items are grammatically incorrect but pragmatically appropriate. These are the questions 2, 5, 8, 9, 12, 14, 18 and 19. The grammatical errors are categorized in eight groups as follows:

Table 2. Pragmatically Appropriate but Grammatically Incorrect Items

Category	Error Type	Example
Category 1	(Item 2) redundancy of preposition	I could not sleep well **on** last night.
Category 2	(Item 5) incorrect singular/plural agreement	That's great. Thank you so much for all the information**s.**
Category 3	(Item 8) error with short answers	Yes, I would **like**
Category 4	(Item 9) a double marking of the past	Oh, I'm really sorry but I was in a rush this morning and **didn't brought** it today.
Category 5	(Item 12) redundancy of "to"	Let's **to** go to the snack bar.
Category 6	(Item 14) lack of auxiliary verb 'do'	Could I possibly borrow this book for the weekend if **you not** need it?
Category 7	(Item 18) wrong word order in wh- clause	Excuse me, could you tell me **where is** the library?
Category 8	(Item 19) misuse of gerund with a modal	Oh, I'm very sorry, I completely forgot. Can I giv**ing** it to you tomorrow?

In order to find out if there is a significant difference between freshman and senior ELT students regarding their grammatical awareness, Mann-Whitney U non-parametric test was used. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Mann Whitney U Results for the Grammatically Incorrect Items

Items	Mean Rank		U	Z	p
	Freshman	Senior			
Item 2	23,35	25,86	256	-1.083	.279
Severeness of Item 2	27,56	20,89	206.5	-1.880	.060
Item 5	24,58	24,41	284	-,120	.905
Severeness of Item 5	24,79	24,16	278.5	-,253	.800
Item 8	22,69	26,64	238	-1,336	.182

Severeness of Item 8	22,94	26,34	278,5	-1,141	.254
Item 9	24,88	24,05	276	-,263	.793
Severeness of Item 9	24,85	24,09	277	-,232	.816
Item 12	21,77	27,73	215	-2,018	.044
Severeness of Item 12	22,04	27,41	222	-1,800	.072
Item 14	23,12	26,14	250	-,993	.321
Severeness of Item 14	23,06	26,20	248,5	-1,021	.307
Item 18	23,37	25,95	254	-1,026	.305
Severeness of Item 18	22,98	26,30	246,5	-1, 201	.230
Item 19	22,04	27,41	222	-1,622	.105
Severeness of Item 19	22,56	26,80	235,5	-1,248	.212

Note: p<.001

*"Items" refer to the answers for yes/no questions about judgement of the grammatically inappropriate sentences
*"Severeness of items" refer to the student ratings regarding the severeness of the grammatical errors from (1) not bad at all to (4) very bad.

The results showed that there is no significant difference between the freshman and senior students with respect to their degree of grammatical awareness for any of the items testing grammatical awareness as their perceptions about the severity degree of the grammatical errors in the scenarios (p>.001).

Grammatically Correct but Pragmatically Inappropriate Items

In the DCT, eight out of twenty items are grammatically correct but pragmatically inappropriate. These are items 1, 3, 7, 10, 11, 13, 16, and 20. The pragmatical problems in those items included failure in realizing different speech acts such as requests, apologies, suggestions, and refusals.

Table 4. Mann Whitney U Results for the Pragmatically Inappropriate Items

Items	Mean Rank		U	Z	p
	Freshman	Senior			
Item 1	20,81	28,86	190	-2.293	.022
Severeness of Item 1	20,94	28,70	193.5	-2.054	.040
Item 3	22,81	26, 50	242	-1.066	.286
Severeness of Item 3	22,96	26,32	246	-,929	.353
Item 7	25,08	23,82	271	-.361	.718
Severeness of Item 7	24,62	24,36	283	-.069	.945
Item 10	24,96	23,95	274	-,331	.741
Severeness of Item 10	24,88	24,05	276	-,217	.828
Item 11	23,54	25,64	261	-.710	.477
Severeness of Item 11	23,69	25,45	265	-.453	.651
Item 13	24,31	24,73	281	-.125	.901
Severeness of Item 13	24,63	24,34	282,5	-.085	.932
Item 16	22,96	26,32	246	-1,013	.311
Severeness of Item 16	22,31	25,91	255	-1, 201	.230
Item 20	22,73	26,59	240	-1,103	.270
Severeness of Item 20	23,13	26,11	250	-.805	.421

Note p<.001,

*"Items" refer to the answers for yes/no questions about judgement of the grammatically inappropriate sentences
*"Severeness of items" refer to the student ratings regarding the severeness of the pragmatical errors from (1) not bad at all to (4) very bad.

The results showed that there is no significant difference between the freshman and senior students with respect to their degree of pragmatical awareness for any of the items having pragmatic problems and their perceptions about the severity degree of the pragmatical problems in the scenarios (p>.001).

Both Grammatically Correct and Pragmatically Appropriate Items

There were four items in the DCT which are both grammatically correct and pragmatically appropriate. The item numbers of these control variables are 4, 6, 15, and 17. These items were formulated with respect to the authentic scenarios in literature that student can encounter in real life (Bardovi-Harlig & Dörnyei, 1998). In order to compare the scores of freshman and senior students for control variables, Mann Whitney U test was run as can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5. Mann Whitney U Results for Both Grammatically Correct and Pragmatically Appropriate Items

Items	Mean Rank		U	Z	p
	Freshman	Senior			
Item 4	25.88	22.86	250	-.993	.321
Severeness of Item 4	26.02	22.70	246	-.901	.368
Item 6	24.73	24.23	280	-.217	.828
Severeness of Item 6	24.25	24.80	279.5	-.234	.815
Item 15	24.46	24.55	285	-.028	.977
Severeness of Item 15	24.48	24.52	285	-.014	.989
Item 17	23.50	25.68	260	-1,554	.120
Severeness of Item 17	24,88	24,05	260	-1,554	.120

Note:p<.001
*"Items" refer to the answers for yes/no questions about judgement grammatically correct and pragmatically appropriate items,
*"Severeness of items" refer to the students who incorrectly thought that there was an error in control variables and rated the severeness of the errors they thought.

The Mann Whitney U results showed that there is no significant difference between the freshman and senior students with respect to their degree of pragmatical awareness for any of the items having pragmatic problems and their perceptions about the severity degree of the pragmatical problems in the scenarios (p>.001).

Since there is no significant difference among freshman and senior students with respect to their grammatical and pragmatic awareness levels as well as their perceptions about the severity of the problems, both freshman and senior students were grouped together, and Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test and descriptive statistics were also employed to see if there is a significant difference between the overall mean scores of all the participants for their grammatical and pragmatical awareness.

Table 6. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks and Descriptive Statistics Results for Grammatical, Pragmatical Awareness Mean Scores for all ELT students

	N	M	SD	minimum	maximum	Z	p
Grammatical Awareness	48	2.58	1.81	.0	7	3.63	.000*
Pragmatical Awareness	48	4.02	1.97	1	8		

Note: p<.001

The results yielded that there is a statistically significant difference (Z=3.63, p<.001) between the mean scores of ELT students' pragmatic awareness (*M*=4.02, *SD*=1.97) and grammatical awareness (*M*=2.58, *SD*=1.81). In other words, ELT students have significantly higher degree of pragmatic awareness when compared with their degree of grammatical awareness.

With the aim of exploring the severity degree rated by all the participants for grammatical and pragmatic errors, Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test and descriptive statistics were computed. The findings of This statistical test are illustrated in Table 7.

Table 7. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Results for Grammatical, Pragmatical Awareness Mean Scores for all ELT Students

	N	M	SD	minimum	maximum	Z	p
Grammatical Error Severity	48	5.37	4.20	.00	16	-4.718	.000
Pragmatical Error Severity	48	11.83	6.32	.00	25		

Note: p<.001

The findings revealed that ELT students scored significantly higher (Z=-4.718, p<.001) with respect to rating the severity of pragmatic errors (*M*=11.83, *SD*=6.32) when compared to their ratings for grammatical errors (*M*=5.37, *SD*=4.20). In other words, ELT students were found to believe that grammatical errors are not so severe to hinder the communication while pragmatic ones are. After these statistically significant differences, Spearman's rho correlation test was also applied in order to explore if there is a significant relationship between the degree of grammatical and pragmatic awareness of ELT students.

The Relationship between the Degree of Grammatical and Pragmatic Awareness among ELT Students

Since there is no significant difference between freshman and senior students' degree of grammatical and pragmatic awareness, they were grouped together to find out whether there is a significant relationship between the degree of their grammatical and pragmatic awareness. With this aim, Spearman's rho was calculated as illustrated in in Table 8.

Table 8. Spearman's Rho Results for the Relationship Between the Grammatical and Pragmatical Awareness Scores of ELT Students

	Pragmatic Score	
	r_s	p
Grammar Score	.300	.039
N	48	48

Note: p<.05

The Spearman's Rho results showed that there is a significant relation between the grammatical and pragmatical awareness scores of the ELT students. However, this association was found to be weak (r_s=.300, p<.05). In other words, having higher degree of grammatical awareness might not necessarily result in having higher degree of pragmatic awareness or vice versa.

The Relationship between the ELT students' Perceptions on the Severity Degree of Grammatical and Pragmatic Errors

In order to find out if there is a significant relationship between the ELT students' perceptions on the severity degree of grammatical and pragmatic errors, Spearman's rho was run. The results of the statistical analysis can be seen in Table 9.

Table 9. Spearman's Rho Results for the Relationship Between the ELT Students' Perceptions on the Severity Degree of Grammatical and Pragmatic Errors

	Pragmatic Error	
	r_s	p
Grammatical Error	.188	.200
N	48	48

Note: p<.05

The results from Spearman's correlation coefficient showed that there is no significant correlation between the ELT students' perceptions on the errors of grammatical and pragmatic awareness (r_s=.188, p<.05).

CONCLUSION and DISCUSSION

The results of the study are discussed with respect to findings of the previous studies in line with the research questions.

The comparison of Freshman and Senior ELT students' Degree of Awareness in Grammar and Pragmatics

The quantitative data analysis showed that there is no significant difference between the freshman and senior students with respect to their grammatical and pragmatical degree of awareness for the incorrect/inappropriate items in DCT (p>.001). Therefore, both freshman and senior students were grouped together, and their overall mean scores for their grammatical and pragmatical awareness degrees were calculated through Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test. The results revealed that ELT students scored significantly higher (M=4.02, SD=1.97) with respect to items testing pragmatic awareness than the items testing their grammatical awareness (M=2.58, SD=1.81). In other words, ELT students were found out to have lower degree of grammatical awareness when compared with their degree of pragmatical awareness. These results are in consistent with the findings from Schauer (2006) and Kaplan (2019) and in contrast to the findings of Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei (1998) and Niezgoda and Röver (2001). One possible reason for contrasting findings might be that the participants in the studies of Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei (1998) and Niezgoda and Röver's (2001) were both EFL and ESL learners, in which ESL learners were found to have more pragmatic awareness due to the more exposure to the language. Similar to the current research, Tulgar (2016) conducted the study with ELT students, they were found to have higher scores for their grammatical degree of awareness contrasting to the studies of these findings, which might be related with the courses they take in ELT. In addition to the comparison of the ELT students' awareness scores in grammar and pragmatics, the severity degrees rated by all the participants for grammatical and pragmatic errors were also analyzed through Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test. The results showed that that ELT students scored significantly higher (Z=-4.718, p<.001) with respect to rating the severity of pragmatic errors (M=11.83, SD=6.32) when compared to their ratings for grammatical errors (M=5.37, SD=4.20). In other words, ELT students were found out to believe that grammatical errors are not so severe to hinder the communication while pragmatic ones are more serious to hinder the communication, which is in contrast to the findings of Tulgar (2016) in which ELT students were found out to get similar scores for rating pragmatic and grammatical severity.

One possible reason for these findings might be related with the ELT curriculum. Freshman students were required to have oral communication skills course two hours in a week for two terms. When the data collected, freshman students got about 40 hours of oral communication skills course. Therefore, they might have been exposed to pragmatic usage of language through authentic materials, role plays and other discourse activities, which might result in developing pragmatic awareness. Similarly, senior students took not only oral communication skills but also World Englishes and Culture courses, which might have raised their pragmatic awareness and competence in intercultural and multicultural contexts. As Yamashita (2008) stated, having exposure to the target pragmatics and living in the L2 country is an advantage in pragmatic comprehension. The participants in this study do not live in an ENL/ESL country; however, they might take the advantage of being exposed to the target pragmatics through the courses they take such as oral communication skills and World Englishes and culture. Another reason might also be associated with their keeping up with the latest trends and changes in EFL learning and teaching through courses based on contemporary approaches in language learning and teaching, which focuses on the significance of communicative and pragmatic aspect of language learning and teaching in intercultural and multicultural contexts. Besides, ELT students are tested on all four skills in English. Tomlinson (2005) stated that recent developments in the communicative focus of many global examinations resulted in positive washback effect in classroom learning and teaching. Similarly, ELT students' being tested about their listening and speaking skills might have also produced in positive washback effect and improvement in their critical communication and interpretation skills as well as pragmatic competence in different contexts.

The Relationship between the Degree of Grammatical and Pragmatic Awareness among ELT Students

The relationship between the grammatical and pragmatic awareness scores of the ELT students was found to be significant but weak (r=.300, p<.05). In other words, being more aware of the grammatical forms and errors might not necessarily result in higher degrees of pragmatic awareness. This finding can be interpreted with reference to the fact that although length of residence and higher levels of proficiency tend to be associated with higher levels of pragmatic competence, they indeed do not guarantee the same levels of developments for every individual or context (Xiao, 2015). For instance, Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei (1998) and Shauer (2006) found that EFL students detected more grammatically problematic scenarios than the pragmatically inappropriate ones. In other words, their higher levels of linguistic knowledge did not automatically lead pragmatic knowledge. Similarly, being more aware of the pragmatic errors might not necessarily result in higher degrees of grammatical awareness. As an example, in the study of Kaplan (2019), EFL learners' degree of pragmatic awareness level was found to be higher than their grammatical awareness level since they do not think that grammatical knowledge is a prerequisite for foreign language competence. In line with these studies, the results of this study yielded that there is a statistically significant difference (Z=3.63, p<.001) between the mean scores of ELT students' pragmatic awareness (M=4.02, SD=1.97) and grammatical awareness (M=2.58, SD=1.81). In other words, ELT students have significantly higher degree of pragmatic awareness when compared with their degree of grammatical awareness.

The reasons for these findings might again be related with ELT courses like oral communication skills and World Englishes and culture which can result in improvement in pragmatic competence and awareness.

To sum up, the relationship between grammatical and pragmatic awareness is significant but weak for the participants of this study.

The Relationship between the ELT students' Perceptions on the Severity Degree of Grammatical and Pragmatic Errors

The results from Spearman's correlation coefficient showed that there is no significant correlation between the ELT students' perceptions on severity of the errors of grammatical and pragmatic awareness (rs=.188, p<.05). One of the latest shifts in language has been observed in the notion of the static view of the language. According to the principles of poststructuralism, Language is viewed as inherently dynamic and susceptible to modification in various contexts and through interactions. The creation of meaning takes place collaboratively during communication, involving multiple semiotic resources (Taguchi, 2011). In line with the ELT curriculum of the participants, they get education with reference to such latest trends and changes in language learning and teaching. Therefore, they might be more aware of the fact that grammatical errors, in general, do not hinder communication as the pragmatic errors since meaning is not constrained to the sentence structures.

SUGGESTIONS

This study was conducted explore and compare the freshman and senior students' grammatical and pragmatic awareness levels as well as their perceived degree of severity for the items with either grammatical or pragmatical errors in Turkish EFL context. The participants were 26 freshman and 22 senior students studying at English Language Teaching Department at a state university. Considering the fact that freshman might reflect their high school English background as first year students at university and seniors might reflect the outcomes of ELT education at university as final year students at university, purposive sampling was adopted in this research. The results showed that there is no significant difference between two groups of students for any of the items regarding their grammatical and pragmatic awareness levels as well as their perceptions of the severity of the mistakes for any of the items with errors. This finding might be related with the English curriculum in ELT department. Freshman takes two hours of Oral Communication Skills course weekly for two terms while senior students take courses like World Englishes and culture as well as new trends in language learning and teaching, which might result in improvement in increased pragmatic awareness for different socio-cultural contexts. With respect to the correlation between the grammatical and pragmatic awareness of students, there is a significant but weak correlation was found, which means that having higher levels of grammatical awareness might not result in higher levels of pragmatic awareness. Besides, "…pedagogical focus on grammatical competence (i.e., accuracy) in L2 classrooms, which might implicitly indicate "certain priorities to the students and thus might encourage grammatical competency at the expense of other competencies" (Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1996). Therefore, as a pedagogical implication, teachers should focus more on developing pragmatic

competence and awareness in students by presenting them authentic activities and materials such as songs, movies and discourse tasks rather than grammar-based activities. Besides, Tomlinson (2005) stated that positive washback can be triggered if the classroom tasks "replicate real-world communication". Therefore, teachers not only focus on developing pragmatic competence and awareness in students but also assess them in the exam by testing four skills.

ELT students in this study were found to have a higher degree of pragmatic awareness (M=4.02, SD=1.97) when compared to the degree of their grammatical awareness (M=2.58, SD=1.81). However, the average score indeed is not so high to claim that their pragmatic awareness levels are enough to encourage them to conduct their lessons in a way to foster students' pragmatic competence and awareness when they have become in-service teachers. In Turkey, there is an ambivalent situation between theory and practice in language teaching. Although preservice teachers get training on new trends and issues in language teaching, most of them tend to teach as they were taught as learners years ago when they become in-service teachers such as grammar-based teaching. The reason for such an ambivalence might stem from prior underlying beliefs about learning and teaching. Under the light of the Lortie's (1975) notion of apprenticeship, prior experiences as learners can be said to have an influence on the way teachers teach. In other words, pre-service teachers have already had beliefs about teaching, which will shape their initial conceptualizations of teaching and learning (Borg, 2009). It might not be possible for teachers to foster pragmatic awareness without being aware of it first. In order to bridge the gap between theory and practice, both in-service and pre-service teachers' perceptions about language teaching with pragmatic and intercultural focus should be investigated. Considering the fact that more and more students in Turkey have immigrant backgrounds, developing pragmatic and intercultural competence for both students and teachers is essential. Therefore, both teachers and students should be given education on pragmatic competence and awareness.

Lastly, this study does come with certain limitations. To begin with, the study's sample size was relatively small, including only 48 students studying English Language Teaching (ELT), which limits the ability to generalize the findings to broader contexts. Additionally, the study relied solely on Discourse Completion Tasks (DCT) as a means of data collection. To gain a more comprehensive understanding, future studies could consider including semi-structured interviews to explore students' perspectives and suggestions on the importance of pragmatic awareness. Another limitation is the homogeneity of the participant pool, which consisted entirely of Turkish students learning English as a foreign language. To add more depth and variety, future research could include participants from different backgrounds and contexts. Finally, the study produced some results that diverged from previous research, so additional studies are needed to verify these findings.

ETHICAL TEXT

In this article, journal writing rules, publication principles, research and publication ethics rules, journal ethics rules were followed. Responsibilities for any violations that may arise regarding the article, belong to the

author(s). Ethical approval was obtained for the study with the decision the Social and Human Sciences Ethics Committee of Pamukkale University dated 24.04.2023 and numbered 68282350/2023/09.

Authors Contribution Rate: Authors Contribution Rate: The first author's contribution rate to the article is 50%. The second author's contribution rate to the article is 50%.

REFERENCES

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

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Bastos, M. T. (2011). Proficiency, length of stay, and intensity of interaction, and the acquisition of conventional expressions in L2 pragmatics. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 8*(3), 347-384. https://doi.org/10.1515/iprg.2011.017

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Do language learners recognize pragmatic violations? Pragmatic versus grammatical awareness in instructed L2 learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 32* (2), 233-   262. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587583

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. S. (1996). Input in an institutional setting. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 17*, 171–188. https://doi.org/10.1017/S027226310001487X

Block, D., & Cameron, D. (Eds.). (2001). *Globalization and Language Teaching* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203193679

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). Investigating cross-cultural pragmatics: An introductory overview. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 1-34). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Borg, S. (2009). Language teacher cognition. In Burns A., Richards J.C. (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 163–171). Cambridge University Press.

Borg, S. (2010). Language teacher research engagement. *Language Teaching, 43*(4), 391-429. doi:10.1017/S0261444810000170

Canagarajah, S. (2021). Materialising semiotic repertoires: Challenges in the interactional analysis of multilingual communication. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *18*(2), 206-225. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2021.1877293

Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to language pedagogy. In J. Richards & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 2– 28). London: Longman.

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

Celce-Murcia, M. (2008). Rethinking the role of communicative competence in language teaching. In M. Celce-Murcia, E. Alcon and M.P. Safont (Eds.), *Intercultural language use and language learning* (pp. 41-57). Springer, Dordrecht.

Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied linguistics*, *6*(2), 5-35.

Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). Pedagogical choices in focus on form. In C. Doughty, & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 197-261). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(1), 83-107. https://doi.org/10.2307/40264512

Fraser, B. (2010). Pragmatic competence: The case of hedging. In Kaltenböck, Mihatsch and Schneider (Eds.), *New approaches to hedging*. (pp. 15-34). Emerald.

Fulcher, G. and Davidson, F. (2007). *Language testing and assessment: An advanced resource book*. Routledge.

Gass, S.M., & Selinker, L. (2008). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course* (3rd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203932841

Gu, Y. (1990). Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics, 14*(2), 237-257. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90082-O

Halliday, M.A.K. (1973). *Explorations in the functions of language*. London: Edward Arnold.

Hinkel, E. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching the four skills. *TESOL Quarterly, 20*(2), 365-383. https://doi.org/10.2307/40264513

Housen, A., & Simoens, H. (2016). In M. Long & C. Doughty (Eds.), *Handbook of language teaching* (pp. 333-350). New York, NY: Wiley-Blackwell.

Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride, & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings* (pp. 269-293). Penguin.

Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A.D. (2010). *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315833842

Kaplan, S. (2019). *University preparatory school students' awareness about grammar and pragmatics*.[Unpublished master's thesis]. Yeditepe University.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. (2001). Pragmatics in language teaching. In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in Language Teaching*. Cambridge Applied Linguistics (pp. 1-10). Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139524797.003

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). Pragmatic development in a second language. *Language Learning, 52*(1), 1–352.

Kramsch, C. (2014). Teaching foreign languages in an era of globalization: Introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, *98*(1), 296-311. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-   4781.2014.12057.x

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. London: University of Chicago Press.

Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S.S. (2011). *Teaching grammar in second language classrooms*: *Integrating form-focused instruction in communicative context*. Routledge.

Niezgoda, K. & Roever, C. (2001). Pragmatic and grammatical awareness: A function of learning environment? In Rose, K. and Kasper, G. (Eds.) *Pragmatics in language teaching*. (pp. 63–79). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ohta, A.S. (2008). Interactional routines and the socialization of interactional style in adult learners of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *31*, 1493- 1512. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(98)00115-5

Robinson, P. (1995). Attention, memory, and the "noticing" hypothesis. *Language learning*, *45*(2), 283-331. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1995.tb00441.x

Schauer, G. A. (2006). Pragmatic awareness in ESL and EFL contexts: Contrast and development. *Language Learning*, *56*(2), 269-318. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0023-8333.2006.00348.x

Schmidt, R., & Frota, S. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition*. (pp. 237-324). Newbury House.

Sharwood-Smith, M. (1993). Input enhancement in instructed SLA: Theoretical bases. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15*(2), 165-179. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100011943

Taguchi, N. (2009). Pragmatic competence in Japanese as a second language: An introduction. In N. Taguchi (Ed.), *Pragmatic competence*, (pp. 1-8). Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110218558.1

Taguchi, N. (2011). Teaching pragmatics: Trends and issues. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *31*, 289-310. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190511000018

Taguchi, N. (2018). Description and explanation of pragmatic development: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods research. *System*, *75*, 23-32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.03.010

Taguchi, N. & Roever, C. (2017). *Second language pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taguchi, N., & Sykes, J. M. (2013). Introduction: Technology in interlanguage pragmatics research and teaching. In N. Taguchi, & J. M. Sykes (Eds.), *Technology in interlanguage pragmatics research and teaching* (pp. 1-15). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/lllt.36.01tag

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*. *4*(2), 91-109. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/4.2.91

Tomlinson, B. (2005). Testing to learn: A personal view of language testing. *ELT Journal*, *59*(1), 39-46. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci005

Tulgar, A. T. (2016) *Students' and faculty members' perceptions of teaching and assessing pragmatic competence in EFL context.* .[Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Atatürk University.

VanPatten, B., & Oikkenon, S. (1996). Explanation versus structured input in processing instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18*(4), 495-510. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100015394

Xiao, F. (2015). Proficiency effect on L2 pragmatic competence. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *(4)*, 557-581. https://doi.org/10.14746/sllt.2015.5.4.3

Yamashita, S. (2008). Investigating interlanguage pragmatic ability: What are we testing?. In Soler, E. A. & Martínez-Flor, A. (Eds.), *Investigating pragmatics in foreign language learning, teaching and testing* (pp.   201-223).   Bristol,   Blue   Ridge   Summit: Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847690869-012