PRAGMATICS EXERCISES AND PRAGMATIC METALANGUAGE
IN *ENGLISH UNITED* TEXTBOOK SERIES
FOR FINNISH UPPER SECONDARY SCHOOL

Master's Thesis
Pirpa Luomala

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty Humanistinen tiedekunta	Laitos – Department Kielten laitos
Tekijä – Author Pirpa Luomala	
Työn nimi – Title PRAGMATICS EXERCISES AND PRAGMATIC METALANGUAGE IN *ENGLISH UNITED* TEXTBOOK SERIES FOR FINNISH UPPER SECONDARY SCHOOL	
Oppiaine – Subject Englanti	Työn laji – Level Pro Gradu -tutkielma
Aika – Month and year Lokakuu 2010	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 82 sivua + 6 liitettä

Tiivistelmä – Abstract

Tämä Pro Gradu -työ tutkii millaista pragmaattista kieliainesta lukion oppikirjasarja *English United* sisältää. Tarkastelun kohteena ovat kirjasarjan kuusi pakollista kurssia ja analyysi keskittyy kuvaamaan kirjojen tehtävien ja metakielen pragmaattista sisältöä. Tutkimuksen tavoitteena on selvittää mitä pragmaattisia käsitteitä kirjan tehtävät ja metakieli käsittelevät ja mitkä käsitteet jäävät vähemmälle huomiolle. Analyysimetodina tutkimuksessa käytetään sisällönanalyysiä. Analyysissä arvioidaan myös millaista metakieltä kirjasarjassa käytetään pragmaattisen kieliaineksen käsittelyssä sekä sitä millaisien tehtävien avulla oppilaiden pragmaattista kompetenssia harjoitetaan.

Tutkimuksen teoriaosassa selvitetään pragmatiikan käsitteitä ja pragmatiikan roolia kieltenopetuksessa, erityisesti tehtävien ja metakielen tasolla. Teoriaosassa tarkastellaan myös aikaisempien tutkimusten tuloksia. Pragmaattisen kieliaineksen määrää ja laatua kielten oppikirjoissa on tutkittu melko laajalti ja tulokset ovat osoittaneet, että oppimateriaalit tarjoavat hyvin vähän mahdollisuuksia harjoittaa pragmaattista kielitaitoa.

Tutkimuksen tulokset osoittavat, että *English United* kirjasarjan tehtävissä ja metakielessä nostetaan esille vain joitain pragmaattisen kielitaidon käsitteitä ja pragmaattisen kompetenssin harjoittamiseen ei ole erityisesti kiinnitetty huomiota kirjasarjan sisällössä. Metakielen avulla pragmaattisia käsitteitä selitetään vain harvoin ja metakieli on suurimmaksi osaksi epäsuoraa. Suurin osa pragmaattiseen kompetenssiin keskittyvistä tehtävistä suoritetaan pari- tai ryhmäkeskusteluina ei-natiivien puhujien kesken, joten harjoitusten autenttisuus ja toimivuus on kyseenalaista. Pragmaattisen kieliaineksen määrä on kirjasarjassa vähäinen, mutta sen laatu ja käsittelyn syvyys kompensoivat tätä puutetta jossain määrin. Niissä kohdin missä pragmaattinen kielitaito nousee esiin, aihetta käsitellään monipuolisesti; hyödyntäen sekä metakieltä että monentyyppisiä tehtäviä. Lopputuloksena voidaan kuitenkin todeta, että pragmaattisen kompetenssin kehittyminen kirjasarjan avulla on hyvin epätodennäköistä.

Asiasanat – Keywords language education, teaching materials, pragmatics, pragmatic competence, metalanguage
Säilytyspaikka – Depository Kielten laitos
Muita tietoja – Additional information

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

The basic goal in learning a foreign language is to be able to express oneself efficiently and to communicate understandably with the target language. In order for communication to succeed, a person has to have knowledge of the grammar, syntax, semantics and phonology of the language in question. However, as the human communication system is quite complex and multilayered, mastering the linguistic rules is not enough, but on top of them, one also needs understanding of the sociocultural and pragmatic rules of the target language. Forming a grammatically correct utterance is merely the first step in using a language. Knowing which linguistic form to choose, when, where and with whom to use it and why, are questions that a proficient language learner must also address. Fluent and proficient language use requires that the pragmatic knowledge should be reasonably well developed (Zohreh & Eslami-Rasekh 2008: 178). Although some of the necessary pragmatic knowledge can be transferred directly from the learner's first language (L1), more often than not the pragmatic rules and conventions in L1 and a foreign language differ significantly, and therefore need to be consciously learned and practiced. As international and cross-cultural communication has become a part of everyday life in Finland, pragmatic competence is an important asset to a person and thus, rehearsing pragmatic skills alongside other linguistic aspects should be one of the objectives of language teaching in formal education.

In Finnish formal instruction of English, the learning environment most commonly comprises of a non-native language teacher, a fairly large classroom full of learners with very dissimilar aptitudes, and the teaching materials, which refers to anything that can be used to facilitate the learning of a language, such as textbooks, printouts, grammars or CDs. Teaching authentic language use, that resembles the way the language is used in the "real world" outside the classroom, in these circumstances is very challenging and the teaching materials play an integral role in offering the

students a model of real-life language use. Although language teachers have the opportunity to develop their own materials, the most commonly used materials are commercially published textbooks. As Vellenga (2004) aptly points out, the textbook is often the very center of the curriculum and syllabus. This being the case, textbooks used should be carefully designed, to make sure that they are perfectly in line with the learning objectives of the National Core Curriculum. Basically, the chosen textbook should provide all the important linguistic input outlined for each stage of learning. However, studies have shown (for example Vellenga 2004, Usó-Juan 2007) that textbooks rarely provide enough information for learners to successfully acquire pragmatic competence. Knowledge about how conversations work and what the sociocultural norms and practices are in each communication culture is often inadequately presented in the textbook contents (Bardovi-Harling 2001: 25). In order for students to learn how language really works, they need authentic materials of authentic communication situations. The demand for pragmatic input is particularly relevant when upper secondary school teaching materials are concerned, because at this level, students are quite proficient language users. Most students in upper secondary school study English as their A1 language, that is, the language that has started in the lower stage of the comprehensive school and that is obligatory to all students. In other words, at upper secondary school stage, they are at an advanced level and competent to understand the subtleties of English

Practicing pragmatic abilities in a classroom requires student-centered interaction. The teaching materials should provide a relatively wide range of exercises designed to rehearse the sociopragmatic knowledge of students. Kasper (1997) suggests activities such as role-play, simulation, and drama to engage students in different social roles and speech events. The activities in the textbooks provide valuable opportunities to practice the pragmatic and sociolinguistic skills that students need in their everyday interactions outside the classroom. Pragmatic competence can

also be acquired through raising awareness on the pragmatic aspects of second language (L2), and in this process, the metalanguage, that is, "a language which is used to describe language" (Lyons 1995: 7), can assist significantly. In teaching and learning of any language, metalanguage is essential, both in classroom interaction and within the teaching materials. In language instruction context, metalanguage helps the learners to understand the key elements of the target language and the major differences between the target language and the learner's L1. Evidently, as the learner's metalinguistic awareness increases, the level of language proficiency increases as well (Renou 2001: 261), and therefore the teaching materials should be rich in pragmatic metalanguage.

This study focuses on looking at pragmatics in the exercises and the metalanguage of *English United* textbook series for Finnish upper secondary school. The study will investigate which pragmatic concepts are discussed in the books and how the pragmatic aspects of English are presented through metalanguage. The aim is to find out what kind of pragmatically relevant input the book series offers and how well it succeeds in rehearsing authentic language use and pragmatic competence. There are several differences in the pragmatic rules between Finnish and English language, and the students at this stage of learning should be made aware of this divergence.

English United book series was chosen as the data for this study because at the time when this study begun, it was the latest textbook series released for upper secondary schools. According to the *English United* publisher's website (Tammi Website 2010), this particular teaching material pays special attention to increasing the students' cultural knowledge and skills. Thus, it is interesting to see whether the book series offers knowledge about pragmatic aspects of English, and whether the students are encouraged to appreciate the subtle differences in the pragmatic norms. As a future English teacher, I believe this issue to be very important,

because the reality in upper secondary schools tends to be that the pragmatic language use and cultural skills are given very little attention. Although the cultural and pragmatic issues may be occasionally addressed in teaching English as a foreign language (EFL), previous studies (for example Vellenga 2004, Usó-Juan 2007) have indicated that the teaching materials do not systematically deal with the ways in which the linguistic choices are affected by setting, situation, status and purpose. I strongly believe that if the communicative aspects of language and pragmatic competence were a central theme in EFL classes, it would significantly benefit students in their everyday communication situations and in their future careers. As previous research has shown, there is a lack of pragmatic input in EFL materials, and this study will give insight on whether this is the case in one of the Finnish upper secondary school EFL materials as well.

2 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

This study focuses on examining pragmatics in the exercises and the metalanguage of *English United* textbook series for Finnish upper secondary school. The key terms and concepts are pragmatics, pragmatic competence in second language teaching and learning, pragmatic exercises, and metalanguage, and these concepts are defined and discussed in the following segment. Previous studies concerning pragmatics in language teaching and foreign language materials are also introduced.

2.1 Defining pragmatics

The term pragmatics originates from the work of philosopher Charles Morris (1938), who was interested in determining the aspects involved in the science of signs, or semiotics. Morris assorted three different branches of semiotics; syntactics (or syntax) as the study of "the formal relation of signs to one another", semantics, the study of "the relations of signs to the object to which the signs are applicable" and pragmatics, the study of "the relation of signs to interpreters". (Morris 1938: 6.) According to Morris (1938: 108), pragmatics covers all the psychological, biological, and sociological phenomena which occur when signs are used in communicative ways. Morris's definition of pragmatics was thus much wider than what is understood by the term today, as in his view it included the areas now known as psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, neurolinguistics and much more (Levinson 1983: 2). However, Morris's basic idea, that pragmatics has to do with language and its users, is still echoed in the definitions of pragmatics in modern linguistics, as for instance in Mey's (2001: 310) view of pragmatics as the science of language seen in relation to its users. In addition, dividing linguistics into three branches; syntax, semantics and pragmatics, is still a widely used categorization.

Another way of defining linguistic pragmatics is to state that it deals only with the principles of language usage, and has nothing to do with linguistic structure. That is, as a person's linguistic ability can be divided into (underlying) competence and (actual) performance, pragmatics is interested only in the performance aspects of language. However, as many aspects of language usage and performance are tightly related to language structures, this definition is too restricted as it leaves out important elements of the scope of pragmatics. (Levinson 1983: 7-9.) The problems in outlining pragmatics are due to the fact that the term covers both context-dependent aspects of language structure and principles of language usage that have nothing or little to do with linguistic structure, and coming up with a clear definition that would cover both these of these aspects is difficult (Levinson 1983: 9). Mey (2001: 3) supports this view by stating that it is impossible to define where pragmatics ends and another field of linguistics begins, and thus a completely accurate definition of pragmatics is hard to come by.

Even though an explicit definition of pragmatics is difficult to formulate, a more comprehensive view of the concept can be acquired by looking at what pragmatics studies. According to Levinson (1983: 21), "pragmatics is the study of the relations between language and context that are basic to an account of language understanding". This draws attention to the very aspects of language that cannot be explained by syntax or semantics; the fact that understanding an utterance requires much more than merely knowing the meaning of the words and the grammatical relations between them. Understanding an utterance requires the ability to make inferences that connects what is said to what is jointly assumed by the participants in the interaction or to what has been said before. As there is no direct relationship between words and their referents, the hearer must make correct inferences to identify what the speaker's utterance means (Yule 1996: 17). Pragmatics, thus, offers explanations to sentences and utterances that are grammatically and semantically correct, but contain a deeper, invisible meaning that is context dependent.

According to Mey (2001: 5), pragmatics focuses as much on the users of language as it does on the language itself, whereas other disciplines of linguistics tend to focus on the end-product of language and the structures of language. Pragmatics is interested in both the process of producing language and the producers of language. Mey concludes (2001: 6): "Hence, pragmatics studies the use of language in human communication as determined by the context of society". This notion highlights the context-dependent aspects of meaning in language. A similar view is offered by Crystal (1997), as he defines pragmatics as:

> The study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication. (Crystal 1997: 301)

In other words, each language user must make several choices whenever they enter a communication situation. A pragmatic choice can be, for example, which language form to use, and the decision is made based on the surroundings, the nature of the relationship with the other participant, the degree of formality and so forth. Additionally, one has to take into consideration the possible impact of the message, how the message affects the other participant's perception of the speaker, and what could be the consequences of choosing a certain language form. In short, pragmatic knowledge can be defined as the ability to use language appropriately in each communicative situation, and practicing this ability should receive some attention in formal English instruction as well.

Levinson (1983: 10) points out that there is a difference between universal pragmatics and language-specific pragmatics. Universal pragmatics includes aspects of language use that are similar to all languages around the world, such as the fact that most languages have some forms of greeting and parting rituals, whereas language-specific pragmatics refers to the elements of language that are characteristic to one specific language. For example, in both English and Japanese

languages there are ways of encoding relative social status between participants in an interaction (universal pragmatics), but in Japanese language, these ways of encoding are more complex and varied, and their use requires knowledge of Japanese culture and social norms (language-specific pragmatics). Theoretically, the universal aspects of pragmatics, such as certain conversational patterns and the knowledge of social distance and power, should be successfully transferrable from the learner's L1. However, in dealing with a foreign language, students do not always transfer available information and strategies to new information (Rose & Kasper 2001: 6). Furthermore, in most cases, the differences in the pragmatic norms in L1 and English are significant and the rules of behavior and appropriate language use need to be acquired in order to communicate acccordingly. In this study, both universal and language-specific aspects of pragmatics will be analysed in order to form a comprehensive grasp of what kind of pragmatic features of language the book series introduces to the students.

2.2 Key concepts of pragmatics

As Levinson points out (1983: 21), the best way to understand the concept of pragmatics is to look at what the main objects of study are within this linguistic field. Reviewing the key issues of pragmatics will also provide insight into what are the pragmatic aspects that the students in language classes ought to learn. Two of the most influential textbooks on pragmatics have been chosen as the resource of this revision: Stephen Levinson's *Pragmatics* (1983) and George Yule's *Pragmatics* (1996). These books offer a comprehensive illustration of the issues that are central to the study of pragmatics. Both books have dedicated a segment to the following eight pragmatic concepts: 1) deixis and distance, 2) reference and inference, 3) presupposition and entailment, 4) cooperation and conversational implicature, 5) speech acts, 6) politeness, 7) conversational structure and 8) discourse and culture and these will be discussed next. These

concepts are also central in the present study, as they will serve as the conceptual basis for the content analysis of the English United textbook series.

2.2.1 Deixis and distance

Deixis and distance is a universal pragmatic concept as it manifested in all languages. The term deixis means "pointing" via language (Yule 1996: 9). With deictic expressions the speaker is able to refer to things that are tied to the speaker's immediate context. For example, an expression like "I'll put this here" can only be understood when both the speaker and hearer are in the same physical context. In this utterance, the words "I", "this" and "here" are deictic expressions. Deictic expression can also refer to things that are not immediately present, but both participants in the interaction know what is being referred to, like for example in a sentence "We had such a good time then". In this example, the word "then" refers to a specific time in history, which is known to both participants in the conversation

Traditionally, deictic expressions can be divided into three types. Firstly, there is person deixis which is used to refer to the persons in the speech event (me, you, them). Person deixis determines the "role" of the person referred to, and it can be either first person (I), second person (you) or third person (he). In some languages, the deictic categories of speaker, hearer and others are signified with markers of relative social status, known as honorifics. In French, for instance, the form "tu" is used when speaking to lower, younger and less powerful addressee and the form "vous" when speaking to higher, older or more powerful addressee. (Levinson 1983: 62-63.) Thus, these forms clearly communicate something about the relative social relationship between the speakers. Secondly, there is spatial deixis which points to a physical locations or places (here, there). The spatial deixis is always determined from the speaker's point of view and it

can be elaborated either mentally or physically. For example, when being momentarily away from home, speakers often continue to use "here" to mean the home location. Thirdly, there is temporal deixis, which refers to time (now, then, tomorrow). The interpretation of temporal deictic expressions always depends on knowing the relevant current time. If someone says to us "I'll meet you here in an hour", we cannot know when to be at the meeting place, unless we know what the exact time of the utterance is. (Yule 1996: 12-15.) In short, the decoding of deictic expressions always depends on the context and the speaker's intention, and they express relative distance between the participants in the interaction. In Yule's (1996: 16) words, "deictic expressions always communicate much more than is said". Understanding these context-dependent expressions is central to proficient language use, which is why this concept should be addressed in formal language education as well.

2.2.2 Reference and inference

Reference is another concept that pragmatics studies and Yule (1996: 17) defines it as "an act in which a speaker, or writer, uses linguistic forms to enable a listener, or reader, to identify something". References are always based on the speakers' assumptions of what the hearer already knows. For example, by asking "Can I borrow your Shakespeare?", the speaker is assuming that the hearer knows that what he or she is referring to is a book written by Shakespeare and not the author himself. In order for the reference to succeed, there must also be successful inference on the part of the hearer. As there is no direct relationship between the referent and the actual word, the listener must correctly infer what the speaker intends to identify by using a particular referring expression (Yule 1996: 18). Successful reference is thus inevitably cooperative, with both the speaker and the hearer playing an important part.

Understanding a referring expression also depends on the co-text, that is, the linguistic material surrounding the expression. Thus, a correct interpretation of the sentence "Sweden won the world cup" requires the hearer to accurately infer that the word "Sweden" refers to the sports team, not the government. The correct inference in this case can be made on the basis of the co-text "won the world cup". The physical environment, the context, also plays an essential role in understanding referring expressions. In other words, the co-text and context limit the range of possible interpretations (Yule 1996: 21). Reference is more than just the relationship between the meaning of the word and the object in reality; it is actually a social act, where the speaker places a lot of faith in the hearer in trusting that the word or phrase chosen to identify the object will be interpreted correctly (Yule 1996: 22). Understanding references and making correct inferences in tricky, even in one's mother tongue, and therefore, this issue should be given attention in language instruction and in teaching materials. Communication and language is full of references and learning to interpret them correctly is probably one of the most important skills students should acquire in their language education.

2.2.3 Presupposition and entailment

Most sentences, phrases and utterances contain presuppositions and entailments. According to Yule (1996: 25), "A presupposition is something the speaker assumes to be the case prior to making an utterance". Only speakers have presuppositions, whereas entailment is something that only sentences have. An entailment is, simply put, the logical consequence of a sentence. For example, in a sentence "Jenny's husband bought two lambs", the presuppositions of the speaker are that there is a person named Jenny, and that she has a husband, who bought two lambs. The speaker may also presuppose that Jenny has only one husband and that he didn't' buy any other animals. Thus, the presuppositions of

the speaker may be either right or wrong. Entailments are the consequences that naturally follow from the sentence, regardless of whether the speaker's beliefs are right or wrong. They are quite logical, which is why they are not discussed in pragmatics as much as the more speaker-dependent concept of presupposition. An essential difference between presupposition and entailment is that presupposition always stays constant under negation. For example in sentences "my horse died" and "my horse did not die", even though the semantic meaning of the sentence changes by the negation, the presupposition stays the same: the speaker has a horse. The negation does, however, change the entailments, or logical consequences, of the sentence. (Levinson 1983: 178-179.) Although presuppositions and entailments can be found in both Finnish and English languages, their effect on communication is seldom discussed in language classrooms. Utterances containing presuppositions and entailments may have a major impact on communication and being aware of their implications is important for a competent language user. Thus, these concepts should also be addressed in EFL teaching.

2.2.4 Cooperation and conversational implicature

One of the most important pragmatic principles is the notion that speakers and listeners involved in a conversation naturally cooperate with each other in order for the communication run smoothly. This notion of collaboration was introduced by Grice (1975, 1978, in Levinson 1983: 100), and he has named this tendency as the cooperative principle. The cooperative principle consists of four maxims that guide the forming of utterances in a conversation, and people comply to these maxims when interacting with each other. The maxims are: 1) quantity (the level of informativity of the utterance), 2) quality (truthfulness of the utterance), 3) relation (the level of relativity of the utterance) and 4) manner (clarity of the utterance). In short, the cooperative principle states: "make your

contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (Grice 1975, in Levinson 1983: 101). It is an unstated assumption that everyone follows the cooperative principle and the maxims while conversing with others.

Closely linked to the concept of cooperation is the notion of conversational implicature. As it is assumed that the cooperation principle is followed in every conversation, conversational implicature conveys information that is left unsaid. For example, when someone asks another "Did you bring the milk and the bread?", and the answer is "I brought the milk", the person answering is using a conversational implicature. By leaving out "the bread" and the speaker is implying that he or she only brought milk. (Yule 1996: 40.) The listener is able to infer this information correctly because as the speaker is expected to follow the maxim of quantity, that is, give all the necessary information to the hearer, the fact that the bread is not mentioned can be understood as an indication of the fact that it was not brought. In short, as Mey (2001: 46) states, "Conversational implicature concerns the way we understand an utterance in conversation in accordance with what we expect to hear" Implicatures can thus be defined as things that are communicated without being explicitly expressed.

Conversational implicatures are often used when the goal of an utterance is to create a humorous or ironic effect. By explicitly not following some maxim, a speaker is able to exploit it for communicative purposes. Levinson (1983: 109) calls this action "flouting" or "exploiting" the maxims. For example, if someone asks "Excuse me, do you know what time it is?" and the answer is "Yes", the person responding to the question is exploiting the maxim of quality by not providing enough information. Understanding irony or humor in a foreign language is extremely challenging precisely because it involves a great deal of pragmatic competence and the ability to understand implicatures. Thus,

cooperative principle and conversational implicatures, and how they function in English, is another important objective for formal language instruction.

2.2.5 Speech acts

When people speak they do not merely form sentences and convey information; they actually perform actions via utterances (Yule 1996: 47). An utterance that performs a certain action is called a speech act. For example, the utterance "I now pronounce you husband and wife", is a speech act that performs the action of joining to two people into matrimony.

Speech acts are divided into three categories. Firstly, the there are locutionary acts, which refers to speech acts where the words have a literal meaning. Secondly, illocutionary acts are the kinds of speech acts that perform a certain action, for example informing, ordering, warning etc. Thirdly, there are perlocutionary acts; speech acts that have an affect of the feelings, thoughts or actions of either the speaker of the listener, like for example inspiring, persuading, deterring etc. (Yule 1996: 48-49.) Often these categories of utterances overlap, and a locutionary act can function as an illocutionary act and a perlocutionary act at the same time. For example, the utterance: "The dangerous dog is in the garden" can be understood as a locutionary act, reporting the state of affairs, and referring to a specific dog that is in a specific garden. However, if the sentence is meant as a warning to someone going into the garden, it also functions as an illocutionary act, performing the act of warning. Furthermore, if by stating the utterance, the speaker has an impact on the listener and succeeds in preventing the person from entering the garden, it can be seen as performing a perlocutionary act as well. (Cummings 2005: 7.) The interpretation of which function a specific speech act is meant to perform, is done on the basis of the speech event. Speech event is the larger context where the speech act takes place

(Yule 1996: 48). The earlier example: "I now pronounce you husband and wife", for instance, is a perlocutionary act of ordination which takes place in the speech event of a wedding. The act is interpreted as an ordination because of its immediate context.

The fundamental purpose of communication is to perform actions, to accomplish goals by interacting with other people. Speech acts constitute a substantial part of our daily communication, and even though they are a universal in this respect, the way they are formulated and performed in each language differs significantly. Knowledge of how speech acts are realized cannot be directly transferred from the L1 to a foreign language, and therefore pedagogic instruction is needed.

2.2.6 Politeness

Interaction between people always takes place in some social context. This means that with each conversation the participants are involved in negotiating and creating social distance, power relations and status differences. These social relations largely determine which expressions and utterances are interpreted as appropriate in certain contexts, and which are considered impolite or rude. Politeness is a central issue in pragmatics, since it also deals with how people communicate more than is said.

Politeness is closely related to the concept of face. Face is one's public self-image, the emotional and social self that we expect everyone to recognize and respect. Thus, politeness can be defined as "the means employed to show awareness of another person's face"(Yule 1996: 60). Each person has both a negative face and a positive face. Negative face is the person's need to be independent, to have freedom of action and not to be imposed on by anyone. Positive face means that

person's need to be a member of a social group, to be appreciated and noticed and accepted by others. Based on these two dimensions of face, one can choose to use either positive of negative politeness strategies in interactions with others. Positive strategies are compliments, praises, greetings and all the expressions that somehow show that the other is noticed and appreciated, like for example the phrase: "Good morning. What a lovely hat you have on today!". Negative politeness strategies are expressions that indicate concern for the other's negative face. For example, using modal verbs, including an apology into the utterance and expressing the utterance in the form of a question, are all negative politeness strategies. Negative politeness strategies, as in "I'm sorry to bother you, but could I ask you what time it is", are more commonly used in English-speaking contexts. (Yule 1996: 64) We all have a personal tendency to prioritize either negative or positive facework and the strategy we choose depends more on our cultural preferences than on our linguistic abilities or competence (Mey 2001: 269).

Knowing how to communicate politely is undoubtedly one of the most important skills students in upper secondary schools need to learn. Outside the school environment, the students will most likely use English in intercultural communication situations, where the role of politeness is especially important. When dealing with a foreign language in intercultural interactions, the students need to be aware of the cultural norms of what is considered polite. Furthermore, they need to able to apply those norms to their communication. Issues of politeness should indeed be one of the central learning objectives in EFL classrooms and discussions of politeness should be incorporated into the learning materials as well.

2.2.7 Conversational structure

Pragmatics also studies the structures that regulate conversations. Some of these structures are relatively universal, but there are also considerable differences between different cultures. The concept of turn-taking is one such structure that has both universal and culture-specific elements. Generally conversations follow a pattern, where each speaker gets their own turn when the other speaker reaches a transition relevance place (TRP), which is a point in the conversation that allows any speaker speak up and thus take up the floor in turn. Each potential speaker has to wait until the current speaker clearly marks the TRP, usually by ending a structural unit, like a phrase or a clause, or by deliberately pausing. (Yule 1996: 74.) However, the rules of how long the pause marking TRP should be or whether one should wait for such a mark at all differ significantly cross-culturally.

Backchanneling is another way to structure conversations. When one person is speaking, the listener is expected to give backchanneling signals, like "uh-huh", "right" or "mmm", in order to indicate that he or she is listening. Backchanneling is assumed to take place during conversations and thus the absence of such signals is usually interpreted as meaning something. It could be construed as plain impoliteness or to express disagreement. In interactive situations, silence speaks volumes and is generally interpreted to be somehow meaningful. (Yule 1996: 75.)

There are many automatic patterns in the structure of conversation, like greetings and goodbyes, for example. A greeting is expected to be reciprocated by a greeting and goodbye is usually responded to by a goodbye. These automatic sequences are called adjacency pairs, and they always consist of a first part and a second part, produced by different speakers. Other examples of

adjacency pairs are the patterns of asking a question-answering, thanking-responding and requesting-accepting. (Yule 1996: 77) The first part of an adjacency pair is expected to be answered, and there are actually two kinds of potential responses: a preferred (the expected) or a dispreferred (the unexpected) second part. As Mey (2001: 152) states, "Certain kinds of openings and responses are always and definitely preferred, while others are usually and more or less definitely dispreferred." For example, if the first part of an adjacency pair is an invitation, the preferred and expected second part would be acceptance, whereas the dispreferred and unexpected second part would be refusal. Usually, when participants have to produce second part responses that are dispreferred they do it with the help of several linguistic elements that soften the response. By hesitating, using apologies, hedges or modal verbs the dispreferred second part can be made to sound "better". In other words, generally the dispreferred response leads to more time and more language being used than the preferred response. This has a clear social effect, as the amount of talk used to accomplish a certain social action in interaction directly indicates the relative distance between the participants. (Yule 1996: 82.)

The rules and practices of conversational structure are quite dissimilar in Finnish and English, which is largely due to cultural differences. It could be argued that the TRP, for instance, is expressed much more clearly with longer pauses in Finnish-speaking conversations than in English-speaking contexts. Discussing these cultural differences of conversational structure should be one of the objectives in formal English instruction. Furthermore, even though the students at upper secondary school stage already have some universal pragmatic knowledge on conversational issues, such as the adjacency pairs, they need to be instructed on how their previous knowledge is applied to English language.

2.2.8 Discourse and culture

In addition to smaller pieces of language, like deictic expressions or conversational implicatures, pragmatics is also concerned with larger linguistic entities; the discourse of language. Pragmatic discourse analysis studies how coherence and sequential organization in discourse is produced and understood beyond the unit of sentence (Levinson 1996: 286).

Whenever language is used, we expect it to have coherence, meaning that it makes sense in our normal experience of things. We interpret speech and texts according to our background knowledge and what is familiar to us. The background knowledge that we have is in the form of schemata, our pre-existing knowledge structures. Our schemes are socially constructed and very culture specific. We also have schemata for different types of action sequences, which are assumed to follow a certain pattern. These action schemata are called scripts. (Yule 1996: 85-87.) Going to the movies or a funeral, for instance, is a script. Members of the same culture have several shared scripts that allow them to communicate a great deal without stating things explicitly (Yule 1996: 87). Schemes and scripts are so deeply constructed that we are mostly completely unaware of their existence. In fact, usually only when someone violates of our expectations regarding a script we are able to notice own assumptions about the situation.

The study of these different expectations that are based on culturally diverse schemata and scripts is called cross-cultural pragmatics (Yule 1996: 87). There are major differences between cultures regarding all the pragmatic principles discussed above. The expectations related to positive politeness, for example, are quite different in the United States and Finland. In the United States, complementing and giving praise to others is quite common and expected,

whereas in Finland excessive glorifying of a person is considered uncomfortable. Similar differences can be found between different cultures in turn-taking mechanisms, cooperative principles and how the speech act of thanking is carried out, for instance. Due to these differences, Yule (1996: 88) states that, in fact, we all speak with what could be called "pragmatic accent". Regarding intercultural communication, he concludes: "If we have any hope at all of developing the capacity for cross-cultural communication, we will have to devote a lot more attention to an understanding of what characterizes pragmatic accent, not only in others, but in ourselves."

In conclusion, all the pragmatic concepts discussed above: deictic expressions, reference and inference, presuppositions, conversational implicatures, speech acts, politeness, rules of conversational structure and cultural aspects, are common pragmatic concepts in English, and therefore learning to use and interpret them correctly should be essential in EFL class rooms. Learning merely the linguistic forms of a language without learning the pragmatics of how those forms are used can easily make a person "a social outsider" who speaks in unexpected and inappropriate ways (Yule 1996: 5). This could result in unintentional impoliteness or offensiveness. The ability to understand another speaker's intended meaning and infer what is communicated without being explicitly said is vital for a proficient language user. This ability, pragmatic competence, is discussed next.

2.3 Pragmatic competence in EFL teaching and learning

Through the influence of communicative language teaching (CLT), communicative competence and pragmatic competence have become one of the primary goals of language education. Pragmatic competence is part of a person's overall communicative competence. The term communicative

competence has been credited to Hymes (1971), who is concerned with adding a sociocultural dimension to linguistic theory. In his view, speakers of a language need to have more than grammatical competence in order to communicate effectively in a language; they also need to know how the language is used by members of a speech community to accomplish their purposes. Hymes (1971: 278) states: "There are rules of use without which the rules of grammar would be useless". In his model of communicative competence, Hymes presents four parameters that describe the conditions relevant to all communicative situations: knowledge of 1) what is possible, 2) what is feasible, 3) what is appropriate and 4) what is actually done (Hymes 1971: 281). He further adds that knowledge of these parameters is only a part of communicative competence, and the ability to use is also related to each of them.

Lyons (1977) describes communicative competence by focusing on the effects of context on communication. He used the term "omnicompentence" to describe language ability and the term implies to "not only perfect mastery of the rules which determine the well-formedness of sentences, but also the ability to contextualize them appropriately in terms of the relevant variables" (Lyons 1977: 574). The 2relevant variables" in his description refer to context variables, which in his view are the most important factors in any interaction. The context variables can be identified by asking what kinds of knowledge the participants in the interactional situation need to have in addition to their knowledge of the phonological and grammatical rules of the language. In Lyons's view (1977: 574-584), a competent communicator needs to have knowledge of six context variables: 1) role and status (both the speaker's role in the situation and the relative social status), 2) location in space and time (for example, whether it is morning or evening), 3) degree of formality (for example, is the situation formal, casual or intimate), 4) appropriate medium (the code or style, for example spoken or written language), 5) subject-matter (what is being discussed) and 6)

province, or domain, to which the situation belongs (for example, is the conversation related to work or school). The last two variables, subject-matter and domain, can also be described as register (Lyons 1977: 584). Lyons's emphasis on context-depended aspects of language use is directly related to Mey's definition of pragmatics, which also focused on the conditions of human language use determined by the context of society (Mey 2001: 6). Therefore, it could be argued that Lyons's model explains to a large degree what pragmatic competence is all about.

The model created by Canale and Swain (1980) divided communicative competence into three components: 1) linguistic competence: morphology, syntax semantics and phonology, 2) sociocultural competence: sociocultural rules and textual rules, and 3) strategic competence: the ability to make up for lack of knowledge of grammar of vocabulary in communication situations, that is, communication strategies. Out of these three elements, the second component, sociocultural competence, contains the idea of rules in language use, and thus it can be seen as parallel to the concept of pragmatic competence. The model of Canale and Swain was developed further by Bachman (1990) who divided communicative competence into two categories: 1) organizational knowledge, which includes both grammatical and discourse competence, and 2) pragmatic competence, which includes sociolinguistic, propositional and functional knowledge. In Bachman's model, the organizational competence refers to a person's ability to produce and identify grammatical and ungrammatical forms, and also to understand how to organize components of language in a meaningful way. According to Alcón Soler's and Martínez-Flor's evaluation (2008: 5), pagmatic competence in Bachman's model is considered to be dealing with the relationship between utterances and the acts that are performed through these utterances, as well as the sociocultural practices that regulate the appropriate usage of these utterances. Bachman's aspiration to create a model of

communicative language ability originated from the need to find clear definitions and a basis for the development of language testing. Although Bachman (1990: 81) states that his model is by no means a complete theory of communicative language abilities, it has been very influential and often cited in the research field of communicative language teaching.

Common to all the above models of communicative and pragmatic competence is the idea that competent language use requires more than just knowledge of the structures of language. In order to become a communicatively competent speaker, one needs understanding of the sociocultural rules and pragmatic norms of the target language. Thus, if the principles of CLT and the objectives of National Core Curriculum are to be followed, the development of students' pragmatic competence needs to be supported in formal language instruction by offering them enough possibilities to practice pragmatic skills and by raising their awareness on sociocultural issues.

2.3.1 Pragmatic exercises in EFL teaching and learning

Traditionally, EFL teaching has focused on helping the students to master the grammatical rules of English and to learn the words and their semantic meanings. However, as stated above, all this knowledge is meaningless unless the learner also has pragmatic knowledge on how to apply the rules and knowledge. The learners in upper secondary school already have a great deal of universal pragmatic knowledge at their disposal, but research has shown that they do not always use what they already know (Kasper 1997). Pedagogic instruction on pragmatic aspects of language is needed to make students more aware of what they already know and to encourage them to use their universal or transferrable L1 pragmatic knowledge in L2 contexts.

Kasper (1997) mentions three main methods for teaching pragmatic abilities in language classrooms, and the first and foremost is the teacher's model of language use and the overall classroom management. By talking to the students and instructing them what to do, the teacher offers the students a valuable model of communicative language use. This is why it is crucially important that the classroom management is performed in L2, so that the target language truly functions as the means of communication. If the classroom interaction between students and the teacher is carried out in their mother tongue, this deprives the students of an important source of pragmatic knowledge.

While the classroom talk is completely up to the teacher, the other two means of teaching pragmatic competence, practising through exercises and awareness-raising, can be incorporated into the teaching materials. In formal education, the most commonly used materials are commercially published textbooks. Textbooks are popular because they are probably the most convenient form of presenting materials; they help to achieve consistency and continuation in how the language items are presented and rehearsed and they give learners a sense of system, cohesion and progress. Furthermore, they help teachers to prepare the lessons and the learners to revise later what they learned in class. However, the opponents of commercial course books argue that they are a form of materials that cannot provide diverse learning possibilities to cater for an individual learner's needs and that they are un-authentic and superficial and remove initiative from teachers. (Tomlinson 2001: 67.) According to Tomlinson (2003: 18), the most important thing that a learning material has to do is help the learner to connect the learning experience in formal education to their own life outside the classroom. This is why the materials should do more than simply rehearse the targeted linguistic features; they should provide the learners with opportunities to use the target language to achieve communicative purposes, that is, practise pragmatic competence.

According to Kasper (1997), there are two types of exercises that can be used in class for practicing pragmatic aspects of language and that can be included in the materials; referential and interpersonal communication exercises. First, in referential communication exercises students have to refer to concepts for which they do not know the necessary L2 words. For instance, exercises, where the students are asked to infer the meaning of a word or a sentence on the basis of the co-text, are referential. These exercises expand students' vocabulary and develop their strategic competence. Second, the interpersonal communication exercises focus on participants' social relationships and include communicative acts, such as opening and closing conversations, expressing emotive responses, as in thanking and apologizing, or influencing the other person, as in requesting, suggesting, inviting, and offering. These exercises include activities such as role-play, simulation and drama. The teaching materials should include a large variety of diverse exercises in both referential and communication exercises. The awareness-raising can also be assisted considerably by the textbooks, with the means of metalanguage.

2.3.2 Pragmatic metalanguage in EFL teaching and learning

In foreign language learning, both conscious and unconscious cognitive processes are involved (Schmidt 1990: 131). According to Schmidt (1990: 149), noticing and deliberately paying attention to the language forms significantly facilitates language learning, and may even be a prerequisite for adult learners. The conscious understanding of a certain aspect of language makes it possible for the learner to analyse it and compare it to what he or she has learned before, which in turn results in memorizing and language acquisition (Schmidt 1990: 132-134). This conscious process can be considerably assisted through the use of metalanguage in FL instruction.

To state simply, metalanguage is language about the language itself. Weinreich (1980: 7) descbibes it as, "A specialized language for communication about another language (the 'object language')". According to Berry (2005), there are two approaches to defining metalanguage. The traditional approach describes metalanguage as something that can be viewed separately from the "object" language. In other words, the "object" language is the language used and the entirely distinct metalanguage can be used to describe it. This approach is commonly used in foreign language teaching, for instance when describing the grammatical rules of English in Finnish to Finnish learner. The other approach to metalanguage views it as an inseparable part of language, as something that cannot be examined in isolation, and rejects the view of metalanguage as a specialized register of linguists. In other words, this approach sees metalanguage as a function of or dependent on the nature of the object language, out of which it is taken into use. (Berry 2005: 5-6.) Berry labels the former approach as "micro-metalanguage" (language about language) and the latter as "macro-metalanguage" (any language use which alludes to other language use) and stresses that both descriptions of metalanguage are valid in their own context (Berry 2005: 9). In this study the first approach, the more narrow interpretation, will be used, as it is more applicable in the context of foreign language instruction.

Metalanguage is crucially important especially in pragmatic instruction of EFL, since it is the way to make the learner aware of the differences between English and the L1. As Verschueren (1998: 53) states: "(metalanguage) reflects metapragmatic awareness, a crucial force behind the meaning-generating capacity of language in use." In other words, if the students are able to consciously process the language through metalanguage they are more likely to gain deeper understanding of how the language works. From a sociolinguistic perspective, metalanguage also has powerful implications at the societal and

ideological level. As Jaworski, Coupland and Galasinski (1998: 3) state, it basically constructs our understanding of "how language works, what it is usually like, what certain ways of speaking connote and imply, what they *ought* to be like" (emphasis in the original). In short, metalanguage describes language and what it is like and thus, it can ultimately affect people's actions and priorities in a wide range of ways, some more clearly visible than others.

According to Berry (2000: 195-196), linguistic metalanguage in language pedagogy has been a neglected area of investigation. However, metalanguage is indeed important for the learners to fully understand the nature of the target language. Metalanguage needs to be intelligible to the learners, because otherwise it may cause a barrier for learning and prevent access to the learning objectives. If the metalanguage is too detailed and technical, the learner may become frustrated and find the learning objectives too hard to reach. Learning a second language efficiently, which most likely is the goal for the majority of upper secondary school students, involves reflection upon and evaluation of one's own linguistic "products"; that is, metalinguistic processing. According to Fortune (2005: 16), "the use of metalanguage and metalinguistic terms is fundamental in the co-construction of language output and often of knowledge about language as well." That is to say, metalanguage provides a platform for the negotiation of form without which it would be extremely difficult for further learning to occur. Since the use of metalanguage results in increased awareness, more enduring learning results are more likely to occur with whose language items which are attended to with metalanguage.

2.4 Previous research on pragmatics and metalanguage in EFL textbooks

Pragmatics in EFL and ESL textbooks has been studied widely and the results have been congruent. The two studies presented here are Vellenga's study (2004)

on pragmatics in ESL and EFL textbooks and Usó-Juan's study (2007) on the speech act of requesting in ESL textbooks. Vellenga (2004) studied four ESL and four EFL textbooks and analysed the amount and quality of pragmatic information in them. The study consisted of a detailed analysis on the use of metalanguage, explicit treatment of speech acts, and metapragmatic information, including discussions of register, illocutionary force, politeness, appropriacy and usage. Also, in the second part of the study, Vellenga interviewed EFL and ESL teachers to find out how much they produce their own materials and bring pragmatic input from outside the classroom. The findings of the study show that the textbooks lack explicit metapragmatic information, and teacher's manuals rarely supplement adequately. Teacher surveys showed that teachers seldom bring in outside materials related to pragmatics. Vellenga concludes, that due to the lack of pragmatic input in textbooks and the teachers' disregard over pragmatic issues, learning pragmatic competence from textbooks is highly unlikely.

Another study of pragmatics in textbooks was conducted by Usó-Juan (2007). His study focused on analysing five popular ESL tourism textbooks and looking at how the face-threatening speech act of requesting was presented in them. The study examined the textbook activities the learners were expected to carry out in order to practise the speech act of requesting, and also, whether the speech act was presented with modifiers in textbook activities and, if so, what types of modifiers were used. The results of the study revealed that models offered in textbooks on how requests are realised fail to provide learners with enough appropriate input to promote learners' pragmatic competence.

Metalanguage in EFL instruction has been studied mostly in the context of its use in the classroom, both by students and teachers (for example, Fortune 2005, Berry 2004, Brumfit et al 1996). These studies have had similar results in that the

metalanguage can play a facilitative role in focusing attention to specific language forms and in helping students to decide which form to use. One example of these studies is the small-scale research conducted by Brumfit, Mitchell and Hooper (1996). Their study focused on examining the teachers' and students' use of metalanguage in foreign language classrooms in Britain. Their findings showed that teachers' metalanguage in class focused primarily on "language as a system" and neglected the sociolinguistic and pragmatic aspects of language (Brumfit et al 1996). Thus, the results suggest that pragmatic competence is not one of the main objectives in language teaching.

Regarding studies on metalanguage in ELF contexts, pedagogical grammars and their metalanguage is another field that has received some attention. Berry (2000) conducted a study in which he focused on looking at how user-friendly the metalanguage of foreign learners' dictionaries is. As characteristics of user-friendly metalanguage he lists the use of "you" to address the reader, full sentences instead of non-discursive language and codes, personal rather than impersonal style and active rather than passive constructions (Berry, 2000: 198). In short, he concluded that the metalanguage used in dictionaries should be fairly easy to understand and appropriate to the context. Dictionaries and grammatical reference materials traditionally use less user-friendly metalanguage. The overall results of the study indicate that user-friendly metalanguage in grammar referential materials does not necessarily have a more positive effect on the learning outcomes. As a tentative conclusion, Berry suggests that a consistent style, whether it is impersonal or personal, seems to work best in metalinguistic descriptions.

The studies by Brumfit et al. and Berry suggest that metalanguage can have a major effect on the learner and assist the learning process significantly. Even though the beneficial effects of metalanguage are recognized in language

teaching, metalanguage in the context of EFL textbooks remains a neglected area of investigation. Traditionally, metalanguage is used in textbooks only when grammatical aspects are addressed, and metalinguistic discussions on pragmatic issues are left to minimum. This study will examine whether this is the case in *English United* textbook series as well.

Overall, the studies on pragmatics in FL teaching, and in teaching materials, indicate that there is a clear need for pedagogic instruction and that the pragmatic skills cannot be expected to develop without conscious practice. In her review of ten different studies on pragmatic instruction in different contexts, Kasper (1997) states that without some form of instruction, many aspects of pragmatic competence do not develop sufficiently. Her review indicates two integral points about the importance of teaching pragmatic skills. Firstly, the studies that examined whether certain selected pragmatic features were teachable found this indeed to be the case, and comparisons of instructed students with uninstructed control groups showed a clear advantage for the instructed learners. Secondly, the studies that compared the relative effect of explicit and implicit instruction found that students' pragmatic competence improved regardless of the method used, but the explicitly taught students did better than the implicit groups. These findings support the view of the current study, in that the pragmatic instruction should be an integral part of language instruction and, thus, included in the teaching materials.

3 METHODOLOGY

This study adopts an interpretive and qualitative approach to research, in that the basic aim is to describe and understand the investigated phenomenon. However, some qualitative analysis is also included, in order to indicate the proportion of pragmatic input in the textbooks. The main method of analysis is deductive content analysis that is based on conceptual categorization. In the next section, the main research questions are presented and explained, the data is introduced and the research methods are outlined.

3.1 Research questions

This study will be examining the *English United* book series for Finnish upper secondary school and evaluate how well the book series succeeds in supporting the development of the learner's pragmatic competence, and how much it provides extralinguistic knowledge about cultural and contextual issues through metalanguage. The analysis will focus on the quality of pragmatic exercises and metalanguage of the books. The goal of this study is to see whether the book series offers students appropriate information about pragmatics in the form of activities and metalanguage, in order for the students to become more aware of the differences between the pragmatic rules of Finnish and English.

In order to reach these goals, the following three research questions were formulated:

1. Which aspects of pragmatics are addressed in the exercises and metalanguage of the book series? Which aspects are given less attention?

2. What kind of metalanguage is used when addressing pragmatic aspects of language?

3. What kinds of exercises are used to practice the pragmatic competence of students?

With the first research question I hope to find out which specific issues of pragmatics are discussed in the exercises and metalanguage of the books, in order to see whether the materials truly provide the students with a wide range of pragmatic input. The second question will focus on the quality of metapragmatic information in the books, to see how the materials present pragmatic information to learners and whether the information is explicit or implicit in nature. This distinction determines whether the metalanguage explicitly instructs or describes how a language item should be used or whether it merely implicitly introduces or mentions certain aspects of pragmatics. The third question draws attention to the execution of the exercises and aims to find out what kind of possibilities for rehearsing the pragmatic competence the book series offers.

3.2 The data: *English United* textbook series

For the data of this study I have chosen the recently published English book series *English United* for Finnish upper secondary schools, published by Tammi. The main reason for choosing this particular book series was the fact that it is fairly new. The first part of the series, *Course 1*, was published in 2004 and the last part, *Course 7-8*, in 2007. At the time when this study begun, it was the latest complete book series released for upper secondary school. Another important factor in the selection was the fact that the book series promotes to have plenty of input in rehearsing cultural knowledge. According to the publisher's website

(Tammi Website 2010), the book series is developed on the basis of the latest National Core Curriculum for upper secondary school (2003), and thus it should provide the teachers and students with all the necessary ingredients for successful language learning. The book series also claims to consist of authentic materials, such as news reports, book excerpts and poems, to promote "real" language use, and therefore, the materials should also include pragmatic input and discussion of pragmatic rules of English.

The reason for choosing the exercises as the focus of the study is the fact that they are the main component in any textbook and they can significantly assist in rehearsing the pragmatic competence of students. As Kasper (1997) stated, the teaching materials should offer students a wide variety of different types of communicative exercises, in order for them to be able to practice their pragmatic competence and become aware of the pragmatic differences of English and Finnish. Metalanguage was chosen as another focus of this study, because it is also an essential ingredient of textbooks that can serve as a pragmatic input for the learners. Pragmatic metalanguage not only offers the student a comprehensible model of language use, but it also provides valuable information on cultural and contextual aspects (Vellenga 2004). It can facilitate learning, by making students more aware of the specific language items. In addition, according to Fortune (2005: 16), the learning results are more likely to be more enduring when they are attended to with metalanguage, as the use of metalanguage results in increased awareness.

The *English United* book series consists of 6 compulsory courses and 2 optional courses, teacher's materials in print and in CD form, try-outs, and an audio CD for classroom use. Each course has one book, which includes the texts, exercises and grammar sections and a CD of the main texts for each student. The optional courses 7 and 8 make an exception as they are combined into one textbook. Most

Finnish upper secondary schools offer six compulsory courses and two optional courses in English A1 level. In this analysis, I have chosen to investigate only the materials for the six compulsory courses. This is because I am interested to see how well the pragmatic competence of students is developed during upper secondary school in general, and since the optional courses are not included in every student's curriculum they will be left out of the analysis. I will investigate the six textbooks in relation to students' needs, and analyse how much and what kind of pragmatic metalanguage they offer.

3.3 Research method

The method of analysis in this study is content analysis. Content analysis is a research method that strives to make valid and reliable inferences from the content of the examined texts (Krippendorf 2004: 18). The word "texts" here refers not only to data in the written form, but to any representation of communication, such as symbols, images, speeches and conversations. The phenomenon that is under investigation is represented by the data, and by analyzing the data, the researcher creates a literal and explicit description of the studied phenomenon. The aim of content analysis is to organise the data into a summarized and comprehensive form by using different kinds of content categorizations (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2009: 108).

Eskola and Suoranta (2008: 187) consider content analysis to be an especially relevant methodological approach in situations where no single existing method completely fulfills the needs of the study. In content analysis, the analysis can be done by using various ways of organizing, classifying and describing data, instead of just one. There are no strict rules of how the analysis should be carried out, but instead, each researcher has the freedom to develop their own system for categorizations that is best suited for classifying the specific data

(Eskola and Suoranta 2008: 187). The goal of the analysis is to create a systematic and comprehensive description of the phenomenon studied.

Content analysis may be either quantitative or qualitative, depending on the objectives of the study (Huckin 2004: 14-15). In quantitative content analysis, the data is analysed on the basis of certain key words or expressions in the text by calculating the frequencies of how often they appear. The researcher can then make certain inferences based on the frequency. In qualitative content analysis, the focus is on categorizing the meanings in the data, by examining larger stretches of language. The aim in qualitative analysis is to interpret and explain the phenomenon instead of merely describing it. There are no clear boundaries between quantitative and qualitative approach and in fact, most studies using content analysis use these two approaches as complementary. (Huckin 2004: 15-16). This study also uses both quantitative and qualitative analysis in order to create a comprehensive description of the phenomenon in question.

According to Huckin (2004: 14), content analysis can be roughly divided into conceptual and relational analysis. In conceptual analysis, the data is coded and categorised according to a specific concept, or concepts, and the goal is to establish the existence and frequency of those concepts in the data. The relational analysis takes this process one step further, as it not only identifies the concepts but also examines the relationships between them. Furthermore, content analysis can be either inductive or deductive (Huckin 2004: 16). In inductive approach, the data is analysed without any presuppositions or theoretical framework and the findings arise from the data itself. Deductive content analysis, in contrast, adopts a specific theoretical or conceptual point of view that guides the process of analysis and categorization. (Eskola and Suoranta 2008: 151-152.) This study applies the conceptual and deductive approach to content analysis, as the data is categorised based on the pragmatic

concepts introduced in the background section and the aim is to investigate their existence and frequency.

The data was analysed by examining each book page by page and by listing all the exercises and pieces of metalanguage containing pragmatic input into a table. The criteria for determining what constitutes as a pragmatic exercise or metalanguage were drawn on the basis of the theoretical background of this study. In the analysis, any exercise or piece of metalanguage that had reference to 1) deixis and distance, 2) reference and inference, 3) presupposition and entailment, 4) cooperation and conversational implicature, 5) speech acts, 6) politeness, 7) conversational structure or 8) discourse and culture, was coded as pragmatic. The pages containing pragmatic exercises or metalanguage were listed in a table, along with a mention of which specific aspect of pragmatic is addressed. The table will then indicate which aspects of pragmatics are presented in the materials and which aspects are left unattended.

After listing the pragmatic concepts into a table, more specific details about the concepts were analysed. Firstly, the focus of the occurring metalanguage or exercise was identified and included in the table, to provide information on what particular aspects of the concepts are discussed in the books. Secondly, the style of metalanguage was analysed. The framework for analyzing the style of metalanguage was adopted from Vellenga (2004) and edited to fit the purpose of this study. In the analysis, each piece of pragmatic metalanguage was identified and labeled according to its style as either explicit and or implicit metalanguage. These two categories were further separated into four subcategories: explicit category including instructional and descriptive metalanguage, and implicit category including introductive and task-related metalanguage. Instructional metalanguage refers to language that gives explicit instructions on the functions and formation of the specific pragmatic aspect. Descriptive metalanguage here

means all language that explicitly mentions a pragmatic language item and focuses on describing the item; what it is like, how it is usually used and in what kind of situations. Introductive metalanguage refers to any implicit language that seemed to prepare students for some activity by focusing their attention on a particular topic or theme. Task-related metalanguage is implicit language that refers to a certain exercise and focuses the students' attention to the pragmatic aspects of the task.

Thirdly, the exercises were analysed in relation to how they were designed to be carried out. This was done in order to find out whether the books offer different methods for practicing pragmatic competence. As Kasper (1997) pointed out, the pragmatics is taught best when both referential and communicative exercises are used in a variety of ways.

English United book series claims to offer versatile materials for practicing language skills, not just for the matriculation examination, but for real life after graduating secondary school (Tammi Website 2010). The analysis of the variery of exercises and the style metalanguage in the books will provide information on how wide a range of pragmatics has been selected to be presented in the materials, which in turn indicates how well the materials succeed in raising the students' awareness on pragmatic aspects of English.

Analysing pragmatic concepts is challenging because the issues of pragmatics are fundamentally human, that is, they deal with people's intended meanings, assumptions, purposes, goals and actions. The interpretation of the hidden meaning and purpose depends entirely on the individual hearer and thus, it is always inevitably subjective. This is why pragmatics is extremely difficult to analyse in a consistent and objective way (Yule 1996: 4). What complicates the analysis even further, is the fact that the pragmatic concepts introduced in the

background section are somewhat overlapping. For instance, issues of conversational structure can also be categorized as aspects of politeness, and speech acts can be seen to have some elements of discourse and culture. Thus, it is impossible to make clear-cut classifications of the different categories. Furthermore, it can be argued that all language is somehow pragmatic, since pragmatics is deeply incorporated into the structures and semantics of language. In Mey's (2001:3) words, it is impossible to determine where pragmatics ends and another field of linguistics begins. That is why this study focuses on looking at the explicit mentions of pragmatic concepts; the manifest content, instead of the latent pragmatic input. The concepts are partly overlapping and this has been taken into account in the analysis. In cases where an exercise or a piece of metalanguage addresses two or more pragmatic concepts simultaniuosly, each concept is listed as a separate occurrence of a pragmatics. For instance, if a single exercises focused on both speech acts and politeness, both of these concepts are listed in the table.

Due to the nature of a language textbook, the entire content of it can be seen as metalinguistic, and therefore, only the texts introducing exercises and explaining grammatical points or language usage were chosen for the analysis. The main texts and reading passages were left out, since they cannot be considered either as an exercise or a piece of metalanguage. Additionally, the grammar sections of the books were left out of the analysis, because they focus exclusively on grammatical issues and on the syntactic structures of language. Leaving out the main texts resulted also in leaving out the exercises following the main texts, where students are required to answer questions about the contents of the text. This type of exercise could be interpreted as a way to practice interpreting and inferring information. However, as the main texts are excluded of this analysis, it is impossible know whether these exercises merely instruct the student to find the information from the text or to infer it based on

some related information. As pragmatics deals with "things that are communicated without being said" (Yule 1996: 5), these exercises on the contrast, deal with things that are explicitly, albeit in other words, stated in the text. Nonetheless, it must be mentioned that had these exercises been analysed in more detail, there might have been some indication of inference being involved, and thus, the amount of pragmatic input in the books would have been slightly higher. Furthermore, in listening comprehension exercises, as it is impossible to know what the tape includes, nothing can be said about the pragmatics of the exercise.

4 ANALYSIS

In the *English United* textbook series, the six compulsory English A1 level courses are compiled into six books. All six books have a similar structure. Each book is divided into five study units, which introduce a new topic or theme and each unit is further divided into four to eight sections, which focus on different aspects of language. The "Kick-Off' section introduces the upcoming theme of the study unit and prepares the student for the upcoming main text. Immediately after the "Kick-Off" section is the main text, which focuses on a certain theme or topic. After the main text, there are separate sections dedicated to speaking, writing and listening skills, each offering a variety of related exercises. In addition, some of the units contain a special section called "Time out", which concentrates on the strategies and skills needed in studying English and helps the student to find supportive learning techniques. Some units also include a "Phrase box", which introduces a variety of common phrases for specific situations. The grammatical issues are compiled at the end of the book, as a separate grammar section called "The rule book". Within each study unit, there is an indication to the suggested grammar section related to that specific unit.

The following analysis will examine the exercises and metalanguage that touch on pragmatic issues within each book. The focus is on pragmatic concepts of 1) deixis and distance, 2) reference and inference, 3) presupposition and entailment, 4) cooperation and conversational implicature, 5) speech acts, 6) politeness, 7) conversational structure and 8) discourse and culture. The analysis will be presented in the same order in which the upper secondary school students study the books; logically from the first course to the sixth. At the beginning of the analysis of each course, there is a short description of the learning objectives of the course that are determined in the National Core Curriculum for upper

secondary schools 2003. These objectives are central as they naturally affect the contents of the textbooks and thus, the amount of pragmatic input found in the books.

4.1 *Course 1*

The first compulsory course of English A1 level in upper secondary school focuses on "Young people and their world". In other words, the themes of the course are related to students' everyday life, personal interaction and human relations. The emphasis is on reinforcing students' knowledge of vocabulary and basic language structures, and the language used is colloquial and informal. The course also emphasizes discussions, expression of opinions and other oral communication skills. (National Core Curriculum for Upper Secondary Schools 2003: 95-96.)

English United Course 1 textbook consists of 200 pages. As the grammar section is left out of the analysis, the number of pages analysed is 108. Altogether, in *English United Course 1*, there are 16 exercises that explicitly rehearse students' pragmatic competence and 13 of these are addressed with metalanguage. All the pragmatic metalanguage and exercises found in *Course 1* are listed in Table A in Appendix 1. The pragmatic issues discussed in *Course 1* are reference and inference, presupposition and entailment, speech acts, politeness and discourse and culture. Deixis and distance, presupposition, cooperation and conversational implicature and conversational structure are not discussed.

Reference and inference occurs in five exercises in *Course 1*, and in three of these exercises pragmatic metalanguage is also included. In all the reference and inference exercises, the students are asked to infer certain information, based on the co-text or the context, as in this pre-reading exercise:

> Have a look at the following examples from around the world and try to figure
> out the *real meaning* of the phrases and expressions! (*English United, Course 1*,
> 2004: 8, emphasis added)

Some of the inference exercises are more demanding, as there is no correct answer, but the students need to make their own interpretations of the situation. For example, on page 13, the students are asked to infer what the relationship between two people is like, on the basis of a conversation. They need to rely entirely on their own interpretation and find the basis for their inferences independently. The metalanguage used when discussing reference and inference is task-related and implicit, without direct instructions on how the inferring could or should be done. In most cases, the metalanguage is in the form of a single question, which directs students' attention to specific points,

Presupposition and entailment are touched on only once in *Course 1*, and without any metalanguage. On page 91, in exercise 13, there are two advertisements, which present families in need of au pairs. On these advertisements, the occupations of the parents or the life style of the family are not explicitly expressed, but the students are required to infer what the families are like. The exercise utilizes entailments when the students are expected to understand that when the ad says "looking for an au pair who is able to sleep during the day", the logical consequence is that one needs to be awake during the night.

Speech acts are dealt with five times in *Course 1*, and in four out of five cases it is attached with pragmatic metalanguage. The speech acts rehearsed in the exercises are giving advice, making suggestions, agreeing and disagreeing, making requests and pre-requests, and stating opinions. Explicit, instructional metalanguage is used only once when discussing speech acts:

> Sometimes before you actually ask somebody for something, you get the other person ready for it by giving them some background related to your request. This is called **a pre-request**. (*English United*, *Course 1*, 2004: 80, emphasis in the original)

On other occasions, the metalanguage related to speech acts is implicit and task-related, without any direct advice on pragmatic aspects of language. On three occasions, there is also an indication of the illocutionary force of the speech acts. On page 29, for instance, related to the speech act of making suggestions, students are asked to evaluate the illocutionary force of an expression with leading questions: "Can you add any other phrases? Which is the strongest and which is the weakest?". This is naturally draws students' attention to the fact that different expressions have different kinds of implications.

Politeness is explicitly rehearsed in five exercises in *Course 1*. The exercises deal with register and the appropriate level of formality in different contexts, making requests politely, evaluating cross-cultural differences in what is considered polite, polite expressions in Britain and polite tone of voice. Each of the exercises contain pragmatic metalanguage; in two of them it is explicit and in three of them implicit. In discussing register, for example, the metalanguage is very explicit and instructional:

> Registers are different ways of speaking in different situations, either formal or informal. It is very important that you use the correct register. If you are too informal when speaking to your employers for example, they might think you are rude. On the other hand, if you are too formal when speaking to your friends, they might think you are a little strange. (*English United*, *Course 1*, 2004: 13)

This example is one of the few occasions in *Course 1*, where such a long and detailed metalanguage is used in dealing with pragmatic issues. As can be seen from the quotation, the metalanguage touches on register, formality, politeness,

context and appropriacy, and thus offers the student a chance to reflect on several pragmatic issues at the same time. This metalinguistic input is followed by an extensive exercise, involving a listening comprehension and a role-play, where students can practice their pragmatic skills. An example of a more implicit metalanguage related to politeness is on page 108, in exercise 8: "Listen to the following sentence pairs. You will hear each sentence twice. Tick the version that sounds more polite. Why did you choose that version?". This piece of metalanguage highlights the polite aspect of the exercise, but it does not explicitly give instructions on what politeness is or how one sounds polite.

Discourse and culture is the most elaborated pragmatic concept in *Course 1*. These two issues are dealt with in total of seven times. On five occasions there is both an exercise and additional metalanguage, and on two occasions there is only metalanguage related to discourse and culture, but no exercise. Register, context and appropriacy, and their affects on the discourse, as well as how culture affects them, are the pragmatic issues that are most often discussed in *Course 1*. In each of these seven mentions of discourse and culture, in all but one the metalanguage is implicit and merely guiding the students' attention in noticing the pragmatic aspects of the language:

> Have you ever experienced cultural hiccups? It means that you did not know what to do or say or you felt "out of place". Do you think people could have cultural hiccups in their own country? Describe cultural hiccups you have either experienced yourself or heard of. (*English United, Course 1*, 2004: 101)

In this example, nothing is being said about what exactly causes the cultural hiccups or how specifically one could avoid such hiccups, but a lot is left for the students to discuss themselves. In short, the differences in discourse between cultures, and the effects of these differences, are acknowledged in the exercises

and metalanguage of the book, but how these differences originate and can be dealt with is left out.

4.2 *Course 2*

The second compulsory course in English A1 level in upper secondary school is dedicated to issues related to communication and leisure. The themes that are emphasized are safety and well-being and communication and media competence. The focus is on practicing oral communication in different ways and reinforcing and expanding students' knowledge of structures. The students will also rehearse their writing skills with communicative assignments and enhance their oral communication strategies and confidence of expression. (National Core Curriculum 2003: 96.)

Course 2 consists in total of 215 pages. The number of analysed pages, after leaving out the grammar section, is 122. There are altogether 11 mentions of pragmatic issues in *Course 2*; 11 exercises with nine of them paired with metalanguage. Table B in Appendix 2 shows all the pragmatic exercises and metalanguage found in *Course 2*. The pragmatic aspects discussed are reference and inference, speech acts, politeness and discourse and culture. Deixis and distance, presupposition and entailment, cooperation and implicature and conversational structure are not touched on in *Course 2*.

Reference and inference occurs only once in *Course 2*, on page 73, in an exercise in which students are asked to infer what the unfamiliar words mean, on the basis of the context and co-text. The metalanguage on this occasion is in Finnish, and it explicitly advices the students on how to infer the meaning of the words by using as help the context of the sentence and the text as a whole, background knowledge on the issue, the form of the word or the sounding of the word. This

exercise is very clearly designed to rehearse students' pragmatic competence in inferring.

Speech acts are the most commonly touched pragmatic issue in *Course 2*. Out of eleven pragmatic exercises, seven deal with speech acts; how they are formed, how their level of politeness and formality differ in different contexts and their illocutionary force. In five out of seven cases, the speech act is discussed with metalanguage, and in only one of those five occasions the metalanguage is explicit:

> Go through the dialogue between an Irishman and a Finn with your partner in your own words. Remember to use different phrases to keep the conversation flowing, to show that you agree and to soften your disagreements. (*English United*, *Course 2*, 2005: 99)

This example also demonstrates the only occasion in *Course 2* when illocutionary force is touched on in any way. The instruction to "soften your disagreements" can be interpreted as a reference to illocutionary force, and as such, the students' are expected to notice subtle distinctions in the force of the utterances. In most cases, the metalanguage is task-related and more implicit, as for example in this discussion on how to accept a compliment politely:

> Accepting a compliment politely is a very important skill. But it's quite difficult to do – it is sometimes easier to give a compliment than to receive one! Here are some polite phrases you can use when somebody pays you a compliment. (*English United*, *Course 2*, 2005: 21)

This metalanguage is then followed by a phrase box, which presents different speech acts of accepting a compliment, and then an exercise where students role-play different situation related to this speech act. As can be seen from the quotation, this piece of metalanguage also relates to politeness, and is thus,

another example of how several pragmatic aspects are discussed in the same passage.

Politeness is discussed in two exercises, which both include implicit metalanguage as well. In addition to the example above, politeness also occurs on page 43, in the Kick-Off section 4. In this exercise, the students are asked to discuss in groups, using polite phrases of disagreement. As the metalanguage in this exercise is only implicit and task-related, the students are left to their own devices to figure out which expressions are more polite than others and how they should be used in different contexts. In either of the cases, where politeness is mentioned, there are no detailed instructions or descriptions of what constitutes politeness and how it affects every day interactions.

Discourse and culture comes up four times in *Course 2*, and on three occasions there is implicit metalanguage included. The one occasion that does not include metalanguage is an exercise, which only briefly touches on cultural differences, and it is right on the border of being included in the analysis. However, as the content of the exercise deals with culture, it was coded as containing pragmatic input. Basically, all the other cases, where discourse and culture are mentioned, deal with register and level of formality, and they are all related to a task. For example, on page 69, Time Out section 6, there is a writing assignment, which directly mentions register and advices students on how to evaluate registers:

> The register, the style of language we use, depends both on the function and the setting where we use language. As you can see there are five different types of texts below: formal letter, informal letter, formal e-mail, informal e-mail and SMS-message. Discuss with a partner how they differ. Think about the use of structure, vocabulary, expressions and sentence length, for example. (*English United*, *Course 2*, 2005: 69)

This metalanguage is then followed by the example letters and an exercise where students discuss the differences and write their own letters. Here, the

pragmatic competence of students is rehearsed extensively via several different tools: metalanguage, examples, exercise and discussion.

4.3 *Course 3*

The third compulsory course in English A1 level is entitled "Study and work". This course focuses on practicing oral and written communication skills related to studies and working life, as well as active citizenship and entrepreneurship. One of the main study objects is to rehearse understanding and use of language required in formal situations. (National Core Curriculum 2003: 96.)

English United Course 3 consists of 222 pages, and when the grammar section is left out, the total number of pages analysed is 134. Pragmatic aspects are dealt with in the exercises and metalanguage in total of ten times, and the concepts that are included are reference and inference, speech acts, politeness, conversational structure and discourse and culture. The pragmatic findings in *Course 3* are listed in Table C in Appendix 3. The issues that are not discussed at all in the book are deixis and distance, presupposition and entailment and cooperation and implicature.

Reference and inference is dealt with on three occasions in *Course 3*, and on two of these, there is metalanguage included. In the exercises that include metalanguge, the students are asked to infer what the missing words are or what certain expressions refer to, based on the co-text, context or their own previous knowledge:

> In real life, when you read books, newspaper articles or any other texts in English, you cannot check every new word you see. You will have to learn to infer, to figure out what the word or expression means on the basis of some other information. (*English United, Course 3*, 2005: 107)

Following this metalanguage is a list of suggestions on how the inferring could be done and a pre-reading task, where the students' inferring skills are put to the test. The second piece of metalanguge related to reference and inference is much more implicit and does not give direct advice. The students are merely asked figure out what certain words in a text could mean. The third exercise, that does not include any metalanguage, is the most difficult one, as the students' are required to infer more than just the meaning of words and phrases, that is, they need to figure out deeper meanings. In this exercise, on page 127, they are asked to make inferences based on a poem about American Indians, and answer questions like: "What does the following sentence refer to? '*Yeah, it was awful what you guys did to us*.'" This exercise demands certain background knowledge from the students, and they need to be able to infer information that is not explicitly said in the poem.

Speech acts occur only twice in *Course 3*. The first occurrence is on page 26, where the speech act of closing a conversation is rehearsed, with explicit, instructional metalanguage included. The students are instructed on which words and expression to use when closing a conversation politely, and they rehearse this via role-play. The second mention of speech act is on page 75, and the focus is on guessing and reasoning. The students are asked to make up a situation and discuss it with a partner, using a Phrase Box as their tool. This exercise also includes evaluation of illocutionary force:

> Some of the expressions above can be graded as to whether they are a strong opinion or a weak opinion. Which are the strongest and which are the weakest? Can you think of any more expressions? (*English United*, *Course 3*, 2005: 75)

By evaluating the force of the expressions, the students are made more aware of the differences in how these expressions function and what effect they have on the listener.

Politeness is touched on twice in *Course 3*. The first reference to politeness is on page 26, in the same exercise as above, where students practice closing a conversation politely. However, on this occasion, the focus is more on forming the utterances in a polite manner, but there is no discussion on *why* a certain manner or form is more polite than other. The metalanguage in this exercise regarding politeness merely states that one needs to be polite, but does not explain how and why. The second point where politeness occurs is on page 100, and this time the discussion focuses on intonation and sounding polite:

> In order to sound polite, it helps to use a fall-rising tone. --- Tags, like 'aren't you', 'actually', are used to give you a chance to use a fall-rising tone. (*English United*, *Course 3*, 2005: 100)

The exercise linked to this metalanguage is a listening task, where the students evaluate the level of politeness of the expressions and afterwards read the expressions out loud. This exercise is also more focused on the form and correct manner than on the meaning of politeness, but it is still concentrating on politeness and thus counts as a pragmatic exercise.

Conversational structure is discussed on two occasions, and each time there is explicit, instructional metalanguage present. On page 26, when practicing the speech act of closing a conversation, the students are also instructed on patterns of conversations:

> **Anyway** is a way of telling the other person that you would like to end the conversation, but give them a chance to add something if they like.
> (*English United*, *Course 3*, 2005: 26, emphasis in the original)

With this metalanguage the students are given direct advice on how the TRP (transition relevance point) markers should be indicated in conversations. The metalanguage is followed by an exercise where the students role-play a conversational situation, and this gives them a chance to practice using the TRP

markers right after learning about them. The second point where conversational structure is discussed is on page 72 :

> To show that you are interested, that you are really listening, you look at the speaker, your posture may somehow imitate the other person's posture, you nod, say **Right, I see, Uh** etc. at times. (*English United*, *Course 3*, 2005: 72, emphasis in the original)

Here, the students are advised to use back-channeling signals, which are very common in English-speaking contexts, but less so in Finnish culture. The quotation above is merely a small example of the extensive metalanguage on page 72, which describes the features of good listening and how listening affects interpersonal relationships. The metalanguage is followed by a role-play exercise, where the students have the opportunity to rehearse their listening and back-channeling skills with a partner. Furthermore, they are asked to evaluate their own performance after the exercise, which further deepens their learning on the matter.

Discourse and culture, or more specifically just discourse, is discussed three times in *Course 3*. Interestingly, in all three cases, the focus of the exercise is register, context and co-text, and none of the exercises include pragmatic metalanguage. In the first exercise, the students are asked to evaluate a writing style and answer questions related to the style. In the second discourse exercise, they are required to write certain expressions in a more neutral style, and in the third, they listen and discuss appropriate approaches for applying a job. In short, all the exercises are in line with the objectives the National Core Curriculum has set for this particular compulsory course, in that they concentrate on using formal language. The pragmatic aspect of discourse is more of a side issue in these tasks as it is not highlighted in any way.

4.4 *Course 4*

The fourth compulsory course in English A1 level is dedicated to "Society and the surrounding world". The content of the course is based on texts related to societies in Finland and other target countries. The issues of active citizenship and entrepreneurship are also further discussed. This course emphasizes the rehearsing of writing skills and the students are required to write texts suitable for different purposes. Students also rehearse their speaking and reading comprehension on a fairly advanced level, using various strategies. (National Core Curriculum 2003: 96.)

English United Course 4 consists of 210 pages. As the grammar section is left out, the number of pages analysed is 138. Pragmatic aspects occur on 8 pages, and the issues discussed are deixis and distance, reference and inference, cooperation and implicature, speech acts, politeness, conversational structure and discourse and culture. The only pragmatic concept not mentioned in *Course 4* is presupposition and entailment. The pragmatic exercises and metalanguage found in *Course 4* are listed in Table D in Appendix 4.

Deixis and distance is discussed once in *Course 4*, on page 56. On that page, there are lyrics to a song and the students are asked questions regarding the lyrics:

> Take a look at the lyrics on the right. --- Who do you think are 'they' in the line 'it belongs to them'? What is 'it' that belongs to them? What do you think the song is about? (*English United Course 4*, 2006: 56)

There is no explicit metalanguage included, other than the questions, and thus, no instructions on how the deictic expressions could be interpreted or how context affects their use. This discussion exercise draws purely on students'

previous knowledge of person and spatial deixis and no further elaboration of the concepts is offered.

Reference and inference occurs on three different pages. On all three occasions, there is metalanguage involved; once it is explicit and on two points implicit. Two of the mentions of reference and inference include a related exercise. The most explicit treatment of inference is on page 40, where reading strategies are elaborately discussed and a whole paragraph is dedicated to inferring:

> Instead of looking up every unfamiliar word in the dictionary, you should try to figure out what the word could mean. --- Use your general knowledge, the context, the word order, the elements of word formation etc. to help you. (*English United Course 4*, 2006: 40)

Here, the students are directly advised on how to infer meanings from a text. The role of context and co-text are discussed and the students are offered several tips on making accurate inferences. However, yet again, the concept of reference is left out completely. The students are not instructed on how to make references themselves, but merely to infer what references mean in texts and in others' communication. The other two instances where reference and inference are used are both song lyrics, from which students are asked to infer the meanings of words and expressions.

Cooperation and implicature is touched on once in *Course 4*. On pages 77-78 there is an extensive discussion on jokes and how they work in different cultures and languages. The discussion refers to cooperation and implicature on several points, as in the next passage, for example:

> Afterwards, if you liked the joke, you usually say: **That's a good one!** Avoid saying **That's very funny** as people often say this in a sarcastic manner if the joke was not particularly funny. (*English United Course 4*, 2006: 77, emphasis in the original)

Even though nothing explicit is said about the way people cooperate in interaction or how implicature is often a source of humor and sarcasm, this example shows that the issues are nonetheless implicitly presented. The students are made aware that in jokes, there are certain things that are communicated without being said. The whole passage on jokes is in the form of explicit metalanguage and it is followed by an exercise where the students are asked to elaborate on a certain joke and discuss how it could be told in a different context.

Speech acts are also dealt with only once in *Course 4*, on page 136. The speech act in question here is objecting, and there is no pragmatic metalanguage involved. The exercise is in the form of a game, where the students play roles of different characters that are travelling and in the course of their journey encounter situations where they need to make arguments and objections. A Phrase Box is offered as help for the students, but other than that, there are no explicit instructions on the function of the speech act of objecting.

Politeness and conversational structure are both discussed once, in the same page 106, in exercise 16. There is an extensive passage of metalanguage related to gossiping, and the discussion touches on the issue of politeness:

> When somebody tells you a juicy piece of gossip, you have to respond in some way of course. Grunting, or saying nothing at all, will be seen as very rude. (*English United*, *Course 4*, 2006: 106)

However, as the extract shows, there is no indication on *why* grunting is seen as rude or further explanation on politeness strategies etc. The metalanguage merely states that this particular form of language use, or lack of language use, is considered rude. The same page also discusses conversational structure, when describing how gossiping is usually carried out:

> In English, people usually slow down or pause just before they tell you something shocking or surprising. This is because the important information (verbs or nouns) usually come at the end of the sentence. (*English United Course 4*, 2006: 106)

This is an indication of differences in conversational style in different situations and how pauses function in communication. The metalinguistic explanation on gossiping is followed by an exercise, where the students are asked to listen to examples and then role-play gossiping situations in groups. They are explicitly instructed to slow down or pause each time they get to the surprising part, that is, they are given specific instructions on how conversational patterns occur in English.

Discourse and culture appears in *Course 4* in total of three times. The first mention of discourse is on page 18, where students are advised on how to use connectors in their writing, in order to make the text more coherent and easier to understand. There is also discussion on how certain connectors, such as "at first", determine the logical order of events and sentences. This mention does not include an exercise; it is merely an instructional piece of metalanguage. The second mention of discourse and culture is on page 77-78, where there is an extensive metalinguistic discussion on jokes. The discussion touches on cultural schemata, as it explains how different cultures find different things amusing:

> So in general you have to be very careful when you tell a joke to somebody from another culture: firstly they might not find it funny --- and secondly they might even be offended. (*English United Course 4*, 2006:77)

The cross-cultural differences in humor are not explained further, and neither are other issues related to the discourse of humor. The metalanguage merely states that certain differences exist. The third mention of discourse and culture is again more related to discourse, more specifically to register and formality. On

page 125 there is an exercise, where the students are asked to evaluate pieces of information and their level of formality and their overall register. The metalanguage related to the exercise is task-related and does not offer any instructions on how and on what basis to evaluate the registers.

4.5 *Course 5*

The theme of the fifth compulsory course in English A1 level is culture. Cultural identity and knowledge of cultures, as well as communication and media competence, are central topics during the course. In this course, the students are asked to prepare a relatively extensive project on the topic they choose and make a presentation about it. (National Core Curriculum 2003: 96.)

English United Course 5 consists of 197 pages. After the grammar section is left out, the number of pages analysed comes down to 130. Pragmatic exercises and metalanguage occur only five times in the book, and the findings are listed on Table E in Appendix 5. As the table shows, this course discusses only the concepts of reference and inference and discourse and culture. Deixis and distance, presupposition and entailment, cooperation and implicature, speech acts, politeness and conversational structure are not mentioned in the book.

The three exercises in *Course 5* that deal with reference and inference all focus on the ability to infer and on how context and co-text affect the process. Two of the exercises focus on inferring the meaning of single words. On page 18, the students are asked to infer the meaning of certain words based on the sentence and the text they are incorporated in, and on page 108, they need to infer what the missing words in the song lyrics are, based on the rest of the song. Both of these exercises are presented with task-related, introductive metalanguage, where the students are given suggestions on what to base their inferences, as in:

"Use the context as well as the rhyme scheme to help you" (*English United*, *Course 5*, 2006: 108). The third inferring exercise focuses more on "how more gets communicated than is said" (Yule 1996: 3), as in this exercise the students need to infer what the writer's opinion is, based on the song lyrics. The opinion of the writer is not explicitly stated in the lyrics, but needs to be inferred correctly based on what the lyrics say. Furthermore, this third exercise does not include any metalanguage at all, so students need to rely on their own pragmatic competence without any help or explanation on the matter.

Discourse and culture comes up two times in *Course 5*. The first mention of discourse and culture is on page 100, where the students' task is to explain certain expressions in another register; first the colloquial expressions in a more formal manner and then the formal expressions in everyday spoken English. This exercise is accompanied by task-related metalanguage that does not give any direct instructions. The second time discourse and culture is discussed, is on page 117, where the students are instructed on how to plan and execute an oral presentation. Here, the metalanguage is more explicit and instructional:

> A successful presentation depends as much on what you say as on how you say it. --- Keep it simple and to the point. If you use complicated arguments, people will lose interest as they will find it difficult to follow you. (*English United Course 5*, 1996: 117)

The main pragmatic aspect discussed in relation to the oral presentation is discourse and how to make the presentation more coherent. The students are also advised to use the appropriate register in their presentation.

4.6 *Course 6*

The sixth compulsory course in English A1 level focuses on science, economy and technology. The emphasis is on understanding demanding language

material and the themes of the course examine different branches of science, technological achievements, different forms of communication and economic life. The students will practice reading strategies and revise their writing skills by writing texts suitable for different purposes. (National Core Curriculum 2003: 96.)

The *English United Course 6* has 191 pages altogether, and after leaving out the grammar section, 118 pages were analysed. *Course 6* presents pragmatic aspects on four different occasions, and all of these are listed in Table F in Appendix 6. The aspects that the book touches on are reference and inference, speech acts, politeness, conversational structure and discourse and culture. Deixis and distance, cooperation and implicature and presupposition and entailment are not discussed.

Reference and inference are rehearsed in two exercises in *Course 6*. On page 54 there is an inference exercise, where the students need to infer what the poet's attitude is based on the verses. The attitude is not directly expressed in the poem, but it needs to be read between the lines. There is no metalanguage included, so the students have to use their previous knowledge on inferring. In the second inference exercise, the students are given some advice on how to proceed: "Before you listen to the song, try to fill in the gaps: use the context, the rhyme scheme and your general knowledge to help you" (*English United*, *Course 6*, 1996: 115). In this exercise, the students also need to look at the whole text and try to make it coherent and logical, so this exercise touches on the themes of discourse and culture as well. The exercise cannot be completed without general background knowledge that is based on cultural schemata, so in that sense, the exercise focuses on rehearsing pragmatic competence in more than one area.

In *Course 6*, there are two occasions where speech acts are dealt with. On page 35, the students are offered a Phrase box that gives examples of how the speech act of speculating and expressing doubt can be performed. They are asked to discuss inventions of science fiction writers by using the given phrases. No metalanguage is included with the exercise, so the differences in illocutionary force of the different expressions is left for the students themselves to figure out. The second occurrence of speech acts is on page 68, where the students practise the speech acts of interrupting and returning to the topic. Here, the metalanguage related to speech acts and their illocutionary force is minimal and merely descriptive.

Politeness and conversational structure are both touched on once during *Course 6*. The exercise on page 68, deals with how conversations work and how to interrupt politely.

> In Anglo-Saxon cultures, it is considered impolite to interrupt somebody without marking the interruption in some way, and bringing the discussion back to the original topic. (*English United Course 6*, 2006: 68)

As the quotations shows, the metalanguage accompanying the exercise is very implicit and does not offer any direct advice on the concept of politeness. The metalanguage does not explain *why* it is considered impolite to interrupt somebody. In addition, there is no further explanation on conversational structure either and the main focus is on carrying out the exercise and learning through practise. In the exercise that follows the metalanguage, the students work in small groups and role-play a discussion on a scientific topic. They are offered a Phrase Box, with example expressions in it, as help.

4.7 Pragmatics exercises and pragmatic metalanguage in *English United*
compulsory courses

Overall, the six compulsory courses of English United book series touch on each
pragmatic concept introduced in the theoretical background section. However,
there are significant differences on how much each aspect is discussed, as Table
1 indicates. The issue that is most often touched on in the exercises and
metalanguage is discourse and culture, as it is discussed in total of 20 times
during the six compulsory courses. The second most elaborated issues are
reference and inference and speech acts, which are both dealt with 17 times.
Politeness comes up in total of 11 times, which makes it the third most often
discussed pragmatic concept. These four concepts are clearly given most
attention in *English United* compulsory courses.

As Table 1 indicates, the concepts that are acknowledged less are deixis and
distance, presupposition and entailment, cooperation and implicature, which
are all touched on only once in all six textbooks. Conversational structure is also
one of the less elaborated concepts as it is discussed only four times in the books.

Table 1.

The number of occurrences of pragmatic concepts in the exercises and metalanguage of *English United* compulsory courses 1-6.

Course	Deixis / distance	Reference / inference	Presupposition / entailment	Cooperation / implicature	Speech acts	Politeness	Conversational structure	Discourse / culture
1	0	5	1	0	5	5	0	7
2	0	1	0	0	7	2	0	4
3	0	3	0	0	2	2	2	3
4	1	3	0	1	1	1	1	3
5	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	2
6	0	2	0	0	2	1	1	1
Total	**1**	**17**	**1**	**1**	**17**	**11**	**4**	**20**

The metalanguage that is used in *English United* Courses 1-6 is quite varied. The occurrences of different styles of metalanguage is presented in Table 2. Both explicit and implicit metalanguage is used throughout the book series, however, implicit metalanguage occurs slightly more frequently than explicit metalanguage. The most often used style of metalanguage is task-related metalanguage that refers to a certain pragmatic exercise, but does not give any explicit information on the pragmatic aspects of language. Task-related metalanguage occurs in total of 32 times in the books. The second most common form of metalanguage is descriptive metalanguage, which explicitly mentions a pragmatic language item, but focuses merely on describing it and this form can be found on 17 occasions in courses 1-6. Explicit, instructional metalanguage, that clearly instructs the students on how to use a certain pragmatic concept, is used on 11 occasions. Implicit, introductive metalanguage occurs only 7 times.

Table 2.

The number of occurrences of different styles of pragmatic metalanguage in *English United* compulsory courses 1-6.

	Explicit metalanguage		Implicit metalanguage	
Course	Descriptive	Instructional	Introductive	Task-related
1	6	2	0	11
2	2	2	2	8
3	5	4	1	5
4	3	2	2	2
5	0	1	2	4
6	1	0	0	2
Total	17	11	7	32

The most commonly used exercise types for rehearsing pragmatic skills are pair or group discussions, inferring tasks and role-playing, as Table 3 shows. Discussion exercises are the most popular method of practicing pragmatics, as this type of exercise occurs in total of 16 times in the books. Inferring tasks, where the students are asked to infer the meaning of words or expressions, are used 13 times. This type of exercise is the only one that occurs consistently throughout all six books. Role-playing is used 12 times in the books, but this exercise type lessens as the book series progresses. Defining and evaluating language forms as well as listening comprehension tasks are also used more in the first three courses, and their use diminishes towards the end of the series. Defining and evaluating exercises occur in total of 8 times and listening comprehension tasks 7 times. Reading comprehension, oral presentation and writing tasks occur only one to two times, so these types of exercises are seldom used when practicing pragmatic skills.

Table 3.

The number occurrences of different pragmatic exercise types in *English United* compulsory courses 1-6.

Course	Inferring meaning	Listening comprehension	Discussion	Role-play	Reading comprehension	Define/evaluate language forms	Writing task	Oral presentation
1	2	4	5	3	1	3	0	0
2	1	2	3	5	0	1	1	0
3	3	1	4	2	1	3	1	0
4	2	0	3	1	0	0	0	0
5	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
6	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Total	13	7	16	12	2	8	2	1

5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study focused on examining the pragmatics in the exercises and metalanguage of *English United* book series for upper secondary school. The goal was to find out what kind of opportunities the book series offers for practicing the pragmatic competence of the students at this level of learning. The analysis concentrated on the content of the exercises and the metalanguage, and aimed at finding out which pragmatic aspects are addressed in them and which are given less attention. The study also looked at how the exercises were supposed to be carried out, in order to see if the book series offers varied ways of rehearsing pragmatic abilities. Furthermore, the style of the metalanguage was analysed in the intention of finding out if the metalanguage is implicit or explicit and varied enough to raise students' awareness on pragmatics.

One of the main objectives of foreign language teaching in Finland is to develop students' intercultural communication skills. Language instruction should provide the students with skills and knowledge related to language and its use and offer them opportunities to develop their awareness, understanding and appreciation of the culture of the area or community where the language is spoken (National Core Curriculum 2003: 94). The evaluation of teaching materials is of vital importance, because the course books should follow the objectives of the National Core Curriculum and provide all the necessary input for students. The lack of pragmatic input in teaching materials has been indicated by several studies and the results of this study support the earlier findings.

The first aim of this study was to find out which aspects of pragmatics are addressed in the exercises and metalanguage of the book series, and also, which

aspects are given less attention. The pragmatic concepts that are practiced most often in *English United* book series were discourse and culture, reference and inference, speech acts and politeness. These issues are given most attention in the exercises, and they are also explained through metalanguage more often than other pragmatic concepts. Discourse and culture is the most often discussed pragmatic concept, as it comes up in total of 20 times in the six books. The issues that are mostly addressed in relation to discourse and culture are register, especially formal vs. informal register, and context. A great number of the exercises are dedicated to practicing speaking, writing and interpreting different registers. Cultural differences in the pragmatic sense are discussed only on few occasions, and the whole concept of culture is used in the books mostly in the more narrow sense; as something related to arts, high culture and customs. The students are not familiarized with the concepts that Yule (1996) and Levinson (1983) find important: how our cultural schemata is formed or how different cultures have very dissimilar scripts for different interactive situations.

Reference and inference are discussed 17 times in the books, and also repeatedly focus on certain sub-issues. Reference and inference comes up mostly in exercises and metalanguage that asks students to infer the meaning of certain words or phrases based on their context. Indeed, the role of co-text and context described by Yule (1996: 12) is explained to the students on several occasions, and learning to infer information is one of the central pragmatic skills students acquire. The emphasis on inferring is probably due to the matriculation examination, in which students are required to make inferences in both reading and listening comprehension tests. However, more detailed information on how references and inferences work is lacking in the exercises and metalanguage.

Speech acts also come up on 17 occasions in the books and they are mainly dealt with in exercises that focus on practicing expressing a certain speech act in a specific context. The treatment of speech acts in the books focuses mostly on forming the expression correctly, but the meaning and the subtle differences in the force of expressions is given some attention as well. In contrast to the findings of Usó-Juan (2007), *English United* can be commended on providing the students also with deeper knowledge about *how* and *why* certain forms of speech acts are used in certain contexts. However, in discussions of speech acts, metalanguage about illocutionary force could have been easily added, by encouraging students to evaluate the effect of different expressions. On few occasions, where speech acts were practised there was also a metalinguistic question: "which expression is weaker and which stronger?", and these questions could have been added to more exercises. This simple question would draw students' attention on the pragmatic aspect of the utterance because the question indicates that there are differences in the *way* something is said. The students should be encouraged to see that there is a deeper meaning to the words, than merely the semantic meaning.

Politeness is another pragmatic concept that is dealt with more often others in *English United*. Politeness is discussed in 11 occasions, and it is often linked to some other pragmatic concept, such as culture or speech acts. Politeness is treated in the books as a fairly universal concept, and the cross-cultural differences in negative and positive politeness strategies are only slightly touched on. After studying these six books, the students will probably know the basic polite utterances in English and acknowledge the fact that Brits use more polite expressions in their speech than Finns do, but deeper understanding of the concept of politeness that could help them survive in most intercultural interactions is not obtained.

The concepts that are given very little attention in *English United* compulsory courses are deixis and distance, presupposition and entailment, cooperation and implicature and conversational structure. Conversational structure is explicitly rehearsed and discussed only on four occasions during the six courses. In these instances, the rules of how conversations work and the role of pauses, overlaps and back-channeling for instance, are discussed and rehearsed in detail and thus there are included in the results. However, if we were to look at all the discussion exercises in the books, the amount of focus on conversational structures would be significantly greater. There are several exercises where the students are merely instructed to discuss a certain issue, without any further explanation on how the conversation should, or usually does, progress. It could be argued that these exercises also require the students to have certain knowledge of how conversations work. For example in *Course 2*, on page 29, there is a role-play exercise, where students are required to use an appropriate register, but as the participants present two very different registers it can be expected that they also follow different conversational styles. In order to complete the exercise successfully the students need to understand that there is a certain structure in the conversation. However these are not included in the analysis, because the focus was on exercises that **explicitly** rehearse pragmatic skills.

Deixis and distance, presupposition and entailment, cooperation and implicature are each discussed only once in *English United* book series. One explanation for the lack of input on these issues is that some of these concepts are intertwined into other aspects of language and rehearsed along with other skills, and thus, there are no specific exercises designed for them exclusively. For example, deictic expressions are rehearsed more as a grammatical concept, and the pragmatic aspect of them is more of a side issue. Similarly, cooperation is an underlying concept in most discussion exercises and role-plays, so maybe

for this reason the authors of the books have decided not to discuss it in more detail.

Another goal of this study was to see what kind of metalanguage is used when addressing pragmatic aspects of language. Metalanguage is considered to be one of the keys to successful language learning. As Berry (2000: 195-196) has stated, efficient language learning requires the students to reflect upon and evaluate language items; to process them through metalanguage. Furthermore, Kasper (1997) pointed out that metalanguage also has an important role in awareness-raising, which is considered as one of the main methods of teaching pragmatics in classrooms. This study indicates that here is a clear lack of pragmatic metalanguage in the six compulsory courses of *English United*. Pragmatic metalanguage occurs 65 times in the six courses, which is a relatively small number considering that the number of pages analysed come up to 750 in total. Explicitly pragmatic aspects are explained and described on 27 occasions and implicit metalanguage occurs 37 times. Explicit metalanguage on questions like why a certain form is used, in what contexts, and with what effect should be included in the books in order for the students to learn how sometimes more is communicated than is said. Implicit metalanguage in the books merely functions as means for raising awareness, but it does not explain the language aspects in more detail. In this respect, the students are not offered enough metalinguistic input in order for them to notice and fully understand the nature of the target language.

The lack of pragmatic metalanguage could very well be a conscious choice on behalf of the authors. Most likely they have had to make several difficult choices between elements that help make the books more pedagogic and elements that keep the materials interesting to the students. According to Tomlinson (2003: 18), the most important thing that a learning material has to do is help the learner to

connect the learning experience in the classroom to their own life outside the course. It is only natural that the materials need to be related to real life and appealing to the students in order for any learning to take place. This is why keeping explicit metalanguage at the minimum might be a wise choice, as it could help to avoid sounding too patronising.

An interesting observation found in the analysis was that the amount of pragmatic input actually decreases as the book series progresses. In the first course, pragmatic aspects are discussed on 16 occasions, whereas in the last compulsory course the number drops to four. This is most surprising, since the development could have been expected to go the other way around. As the students' language skills progress, it could be assumed that their ability to acquire pragmatic competence would increase as well, and thus they should be offered more pragmatic input while advancing. One possible reason for the decreasing of pragmatic input as the book series proceeds is the approaching matriculation examination at the end of upper secondary school. Matriculation examination focuses on areas of language where the learning outcomes are easily tested, such as writing, listening and grammatical knowledge. Testing students' pragmatic competence is problematic the questions of test validity and reliability are under debate. It is only natural that in formal education, what is not tested and controlled is taken less notice of in teaching. This wash-back effect is unfortunate, as in real life, most students would benefit more if the EFL instruction focused more on the pragmatic aspects of language and prepared the students for challenges of everyday interactions.

The third research question of this study aimed at finding out what kinds of exercises are used to practice pragmatic abilities of students. A majority of the pragmatic exercises in *English United* book series are carried out as pair or group work, where the students are asked to communicate with each other. Working

with other students teaches the importance of team work, and builds the students' skills of communicating with different people, but in the end this might not be the ideal way to rehearse pragmatic skills of a foreign language. Performing an exercise with another Finnish-speaking student is problematic because neither of the speakers is able to correct the other or provide authentic feedback. The teacher's role in this is crucial as he or she can circle around the classroom, to listen and to give feedback, but is that still enough to make the students acquire pragmatic competence? The classroom setting and the big group sizes are issues that complicate the teaching of pragmatic skills, even with the best possible teaching material.

Even though the quantity of pragmatic input in the book series is reasonably low, the quality of the pragmatic exercises and metalanguage somewhat makes up for it. On several occasions, the pragmatic aspects of language are discussed quite elaborately and extensively. For example in *Course 2*, on page 21, the speech act of accepting a compliment is discussed with extensive metalanguage, which is supported with a "Phrase Box" that presents different forms of the speech act. The metalanguage is then followed by an exercise where students practice the speech act. As this example shows, the pragmatic competence of students is practiced by using various teaching methods and by really focusing on the issue. The book integrates exercises, so that one exercise rehearses more than one linguistic feature at a time. Strength of the book is that the language skills are realized as a unity in which linguistic functions are intertwined and support one another.

In order to achieve a more comprehensive view on the state of teaching and learning of pragmatics in upper secondary schools, more than one book series should be investigated. This study focused on looking at one textbook series thus the findings cannot be generalised to apply to all existing textbooks.

Further studies could be conducted by comparing different book series to see whether there are differences and if some provide more practise than others.

This study hopefully brings more insight into the research area of EFL teaching and learning and materials development in Finland. By analysing in more detail the pragmatic input of one of the most recently published book series for Finnish upper secondary school, the study provides more detailed information on how the teaching materials could be developed further. As the textbook has such a big influence on what happens in the classroom and what the learning outcomes will be, it is important to closely analyse the quality of the teaching materials.

The study increases awareness on the importance of teaching pragmatic competence in Finnish upper secondary schools, where the students are at the prime of their language learning and acquisition. In upper secondary school, the matriculation examination dictates to a great extent what is taught in the classroom and it is only natural that what is not tested is given less attention in the curriculum. The teaching materials merely follow the objectives outlined in the National Core Curriculum and do their best at including all the necessary linguistic knowledge determined in the syllabus. As long as the pragmatic ability of students is not included as a central part of the matriculation examination, the goals of communicative language teaching are hard to reach.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources:

Daffue-Karsten, L., Luukkonen, H., Moilanen, K., Pollari, P., Venemies, K. and K. Vincent. 2004. *English United, Course 1*. Jyväskylä: Gummerrus Kirjapaino Oy

Daffue-Karsten, L., Luukkonen, H., Moilanen, K., Pollari, P., Venemies, K. and K. Vincent. 2005. *English United, Course 2*. Jyväskylä: Gummerrus Kirjapaino Oy

Daffue-Karsten, L., Luukkonen, H., Moilanen, K., Pollari, P., Venemies, K. and K. Vincent. 2005. *English United, Course 3*. Jyväskylä: Gummerrus Kirjapaino Oy

Daffue-Karsten, L., Luukkonen, H., Moilanen, K., Pollari, P., Venemies, K. and K. Vincent. 2006. *English United, Course 4*. Jyväskylä: Gummerrus Kirjapaino Oy

Daffue-Karsten, L., Luukkonen, H., Moilanen, K., Pollari, P., Venemies, K. and K. Vincent. 2006. *English United, Course 5*. Jyväskylä: Gummerrus Kirjapaino Oy

Daffue-Karsten, L., Luukkonen, H., Moilanen, K., Pollari, P., Venemies, K. and K. Vincent. 2006. *English United, Course 6*. Jyväskylä: Gummerrus Kirjapaino Oy

Secondary sources:

Alcón Soler E. and A. Martínez-Flor. 2008. Pragmatics in foreign language contexts. In E. Alcón Soler and A. Martínez-Flor (eds.), *Investigating pragmatics in foreign language learning, teaching and testing*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 3-21.

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

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

Berry, R. 2000. "You-ser" friendly metalanguage: what effect does it have on learners of English? *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 38 (3-4), 195-211.

Berry, R. 2004. Awareness of metalanguage. *Language Awareness* 13 (1), 1-16.

Berry, R. 2005. Making the most of metalanguage. *Language Awareness* 14 (1), 3-20.

Brumfit, C., R. Mitchell. and J. Hooper. 1996. 'Grammar', 'language' and 'practice'. In M. Hughes (ed.), *Teaching and learning in changing times*. Oxford: Blackwell, 70-87.

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

Cruse, D.A. 2004. *Meaning in language: an introduction to semantics and pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crystal, D. (ed.) 1997. *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cummings, L. 2005. *Pragmatics. A multidisciplinary perspective*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

Eskola, J. and J. Suoranta. 2008. *Johdatus laadulliseen tutkimukseen*. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Fortune, A. 2005. Learners' use of metalanguage in collaborative form-focused L2 output tasks. *Language Awareness* 14 (1), 21-38.

Huckin, T. 2004. Content analysis: what texts talk about. In C. Bazerman and P. Prior (eds.), *What writing does and how it does it. An introduction to analyzing texts and textual practices.* Mahwah (N. J.) : Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hymes, D. H. 1971. On communicative competence. In Pride, J.B. and J. Holmes (eds.), *Sociolinguistics*. Great Britain: Penguin Books, 269-293.

Jaworski, A., N. Coupland and D. Galasinski. 1998. Metalanguage: Why not? In A. Jaworski, N. Coupland and D. Galasinski (eds.), *Metalanguage. Social and ideological perspectives.* Cardiff Roundtable in Sociolinguistics (3 : 1998 : Newtown, Powys, Wales). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kasper, G. 1997. Can pragmatic competence be taught? (NetWork #6) [online] (31 Jul 2010). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center. http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW06/

Krippendorf, K. 2004. *Content analysis. An introduction to its methodology.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Levinson, S. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, J. 1977. *Semantics.* Volume 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morris, C. W. 1938. *Foundations of the theory of signs*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mey, J. 2001. *Pragmatics. An introduction*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers.

National core curriculum for upper secondary schools 2003. Finnish National Board of Education. [online] (20 Aug 2010) http://www.oph.fi/instancedata/prime_product_julkaisu/oph/embeds/47678_core_curricula_upper_secondary_education.pdf

Renou, J. 2001. An examination of the relationship between metalinguistic awareness and second-language proficiency of adult learners of French. *Language Awareness* 10 (4), 248-67.

Rose, K. and G. Kasper (eds.) 2001. *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmidt, R.W. 1990. The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics* 11 (2), 129-158.

Tammi Website. 2010. [online] (22 Sep 2010) http://eu.tammi.fi/

Tomlinson, B. 2001. Materials development. In R. Carter and D. Nunan (eds.), *The Cambrigde guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages.* Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 66-71.

Tomlinson, B. 2003. Materials evaluation. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching.* London: Continuum New York, 15-36.

Tuomi, J. and A. Sarajärvi. 2009. *Laadullinen tutkimus ja sisällönanalyysi.* Helsinki: Tammi.

Usó-Juan, E. 2008. The presentation and practise of the communicative act of requesting in textbooks: focusing on modifiers. In E. Alcón Soler and M. Pilar Safont Jordà (eds.), *Intercultural language use and language learning.* Dordrecht, The Netherlands : Springer, 223-243.

Vellenga, H. 2004. Learning pragmatics from ESL & EFL textbooks: how likely? *TESL-EJ: Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language; The Electronic Journal for English as a Second language* 8 (2) [online] (31 Jul 2010) http://www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume8/ej30/ej30a3/

Verschueren, J. 1998. Notes on the role of pragmatic awareness in language use. In A. Jaworski, Coupland, N. and D. Galasinski (eds.), *Metalanguage. Social and ideological perspectives.* Cardiff Roundtable in Sociolinguistics (3 : 1998 : Newtown, Powys, Wales). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 53-73.

Weinreich, U. 1980. *On Semantics*. Labov, W. and B. Weinreich (eds). Philadelphia : University of Pennsylvania Press.

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

Zohreh, R. and A. Eslami-Rasekh. 2008. Enhancing the pragmatic competence of non-native English-speaking teacher candidates (NNESTCs) in an EFL context. In Alcòn Soler E. and A. Martínez-Flor (eds.), *Investigating pragmatics in foreign language learning, teaching and testing.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 178-197.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

Table A. Pragmatics exercises and pragmatic metalanguage in *English United Course 1.*

Page	Pragmatic concept	Style of pragmatic metalanguage	Focus of metalanguage / exercise	Execution of exercise
4	discourse/ culture	descriptive	register	-
6	discourse/ culture	descriptive	register	-
8	reference / inference	task-related	inference	try to figure out what the real meaning of the expressions is
13-14	discourse/culture, politeness, reference /inference	task-related, descriptive, instructional	register, context, co-text	listen and choose the correct alternatives
14	discourse / culture, reference / inference	task-related	register, inference	discussion, role-play
29	speech act	task-related	suggesting, illocutionary force	role-play, discussion
73	speech act	task-related	agreeing and disagreeing, illocutionary force	listen, repeat, grade the expressions, discussion
80	politeness, speech act	task-related, instructional	making requests and pre-requests, illocutionary force, context	consider different contexts and define how to make requests in each of them
81	speech act	task-related	making requests	role-play
91	reference / inference,	-	understanding	reading

	presupposition /entailment		references and entailments	comprehension
99	reference / inference	-	inference, co-text	infer whether the statements are true or false
99	discourse /culture, politeness	task-related, descriptive	polite behavior	define which actions are considered rude
101	discourse /culture	task-related, descriptive	cultural differences, schemata and scripts	discussion
106-107	discourse /culture, politeness	task-related, descriptive	cross-cultural differences in politeness, appropriacy	listen and fill in the missing information
108	politeness	task-related	polite expressions	listen and choose the more polite expression
108	speech act	-	stating opinions	discussion

APPENDIX 2

Table B. Pragmatics exercises and pragmatic metalanguage in *English United Course 2.*

Page	Pragmatic concept	Style of pragmatic metalanguage	Focus of exercise	Execution of exercise
16	discourse / culture	-	cross-cultural differences	listen and mark statements as true or false
21	politeness, speech act	task-related, descriptive	accepting compliments	listen, role-play
22	speech act	-	expressing an opinion	group discussion
29	discourse / culture	task-related	level of formality, register	role-play
43	politeness, speech act	task-related, introductive	expressing disagreement	group discussion
69-70	discourse / culture, speech act	task-related, descriptive	register, context, accepting an offer	discuss, write a letter in an appropriate register
73	reference /inference	task-related, instructional	inferring the meaning of a word, co-text and context	guess or infer what the words mean
92	discourse / culture	task-related, introductive	level of formality, register	match the colloquial expressions with formal ones
99-100	speech act	task-related, instructional	agreeing, disagreeing and stating opinions, illocutionary force	role-play
106	speech act	task-related	asking for and giving directions	role-play
118-121	speech act	-	asking and giving directions, making requests	a game, role-play

APPENDIX 3

Table C. Pragmatics exercises and pragmatic metalanguage in *English United Course 3*.

Page	Pragmatic concept	Style of pragmatic metalanguage	Focus of exercise	Execution of exercise
26	speech act, conversational structure, politeness	task-related, instructional, descriptive	expressions for closing a conversation politely	role-play
44	discourse / culture	-	register in writing style	evaluate the style of writing, discussion
69	discourse / culture	-	register	write the expressions in a more neutral style
72	conversational structure	task-related, instructional, descriptive	back-channeling	role-play, evaluate your own performance
74	reference / inference	task-related, introductive	inference, role of co-text	try to infer what the missing words of the lyrics could be on the basis of the co-text
75	speech act	task-related, descriptive	guessing and reasoning, illocutionary force	discussion, evaluate the force of the expressions
91	discourse / culture	-	register, appropriacy	discussion
100	politeness	task-related, descriptive, instructional	intonation, polite expressions	listen and evaluate the level of politeness of the expressions, read aloud

107	reference / inference	instructional, descriptive	inference, co-text and context, coherence	read a text and infer what certain words and expressions mean
127	reference / inference	-	inference	figure out what the intended meaning of the expressions is, discussion

APPENDIX 4

Table D. Pragmatics metalanguage and pragmatic exercises in *English United Course 4*.

Page	Pragmatic concept	Style of pragmatic metalanguage	Focus of exercise	Execution of exercise
18	discourse / culture	descriptive	-	-
40	reference / inference	instructional		
53	reference / inference	introductive	inference, co-text and context, intended meanings	infer what the missing words are in the lyrics, discussion
56	deixis / distance, reference / inference	-	inference, person deixis,	infer what the song is about and what is meant with the deictic expressions
77-78	discourse / culture, cooperation / implicature	instructional, descriptive	jokes, sarcasm, culture, context	discussion
106	politeness, conversational structure	task-related, descriptive	responding to gossiping, conversational pace	discussion
125	discourse / culture	task-related, introductive	register, context	discussion
136	speech act	-	objecting	game

APPENDIX 5

Table E. Pragmatics exercises and pragmatic metalanguage in *English United Course 5*.

Page	Pragmatic concept	Style of pragmatic metalanguage	Focus of exercise	Execution of exercise
19	reference / inference	task-related, introductive	inference, co-text	infer the meaning of the words on the basis of the context
72	reference / inference	-	inference	infer what the writers opinion is based on the lyrics
100	discourse / culture	task-related	register	explain words and expressions in a different register
108	reference / inference	task-related, introductive	inference, co-text	infer what the missing words in the lyrics are based on the context
117	discourse / culture	task-related, instructional	appropriacy, register, coherence	oral presentation

APPENDIX 6

Table F. Pragmatics exercises and pragmatic metalanguage in *English United Course 6*.

Page	Pragmatic concept	Style of pragmatic metalanguage	Focus of exercise	Execution of exercise
35	speech act	-	speculating and expressing doubt	discussion
54	reference / inference	-	inference	infer what the writers attitude is based on the text
68	politeness, conversational structure, speech act	task-related, descriptive	interrupting, returning to the topic	role-play
115	discourse / culture, reference / inference	task-related	text coherence, inference	by using the context and your background knowledge, fill in the missing words