



University  
of Stavanger

Faculty of Arts and Education

## MASTERS THESIS

Study programme: Advanced teacher education for levels 8-13, specializing in English and the humanities	Autumn semester, 2018  Open
Author: Kent Ivar Aasten Olsen	Kent Ivar Aasten Olsen ..... (signature author)
Supervisor: Kjetil Vikhamar Thengs	
Title of thesis: EFL Pragmatics Teaching in the Norwegian VG1 Programme for General Studies: Current Teacher Attitudes on the Development of Pupils' Pragmatic Competence	
Keywords: Pragmatics, Pragmatic Competence, Politeness Theory, EFL teaching	No. of pages: 64 + appendices/other: 74  Stavanger, 14.11.2018 date/year

**EFL Pragmatics Teaching in the Norwegian VG1 Programme for  
General Studies: Current Teacher Attitudes on the Development  
of Pupils' Pragmatic Competence**

## **Abstract**

This thesis investigates pragmatics' current position in the first year of the Norwegian EFL programme for upper secondary general studies classes. The aim was to ascertain whether pragmatics is explicitly or implicitly taught, and whether the development of pupils' pragmatic competence is seen as relevant among Norwegian EFL teachers. To this end, a mixed-methods approach was used through a combination of interviews with ten teachers and distribution of DCTs among 166 16-17-year-old Norwegian EFL learners. The teachers and pupils were selected from five different upper secondary schools in Rogaland, Norway. Inspired by existing pragmalinguistic research carried out by Brubæk (2012) and Norenberg (2017), the current thesis and its results can be viewed as follow-up and support of their argument for giving pragmatics and development of pragmatic competence explicit attention in Norwegian EFL instructional settings.

None of the interviewed teachers reported paying explicit attention to developing pragmatic competence in their lessons. The teachers also admitted that they were unfamiliar with the linguistic terms pragmatics and pragmatic competence. A general perception was that pragmatics receives little to no attention in Norwegian EFL classrooms. However, through teaching formal compared to informal writing, the pupils are implicitly (and unconsciously) introduced to pragmatics. Based on the interview data, other pragmatic issues, such as conventions of politeness in L2, are largely disregarded.

Data from the DCTs demonstrated that that pupils rely on L1 request formulations in L2. Native speakers of English tend to more frequently use negation and combinations of past tense and past/present progressive aspects. Only a minor fraction of the participants demonstrated native-like modification, and negation was counted only twice among the data. Instead, pupils opted for simple 'can I/you'-formulations and external modifications, such as grounders.

The current study additionally means to contribute to and inspire further study on pragmatics' and its position in Norwegian EFL instructional settings. To this date, the amount of research conducted on Norwegian pupils' interlanguage pragmalinguistic performance is considerably low compared to similar research carried out internationally. As such, more research is needed to map the extent of possible lacking pragmatic competence in Norwegian EFL classrooms.

## Acknowledgements

There are several people I would like to thank for supporting me throughout the process of creating this thesis. First and foremost, I would like to thank my mother, whose bravery and encouragement despite her fatal illness inspired me to keep working towards finishing the thesis. Though you are no longer with us, I know you would be proud of me, like you always were (and incessantly insisted upon).

Next, I would like to thank my supervisor, Kjetil V. Thengs, whose concrete and helpful feedback, patience, and support helped me row this boat through stormy seas, safe to shore. Future students will, as I am, be grateful for having had you as their supervisor, of that I am certain. Thank you, indeed. I would also like to thank my girlfriend, Maria. Though you had also suffered loss, you knew exactly what to say at exactly the right time to cheer up this distressed student. Together, we found strength, and in moments where I lost faith and did not believe in myself or my own abilities, you were there to set me straight. One cannot ask for more.

Also, a thanks to my father. Our conversations were indeed helpful to make me reflect around the chosen methods used to answer the research questions of this thesis. Though pragmatics research is foreign to you, your genuine curiosity in what it is lead to some interesting conversations. To my step-father and step-brother; thank you for putting up with my frustration and irritation. An additional ‘thank you’ to family I forget to mention, but who nonetheless encouraged me and supported me. To those who participated in the current project I offer my sincere appreciation and gratitude. I could not have done this without you (quite literally).

My Stavanger friends, I already miss our talks and our adventures together. Thank you for countless heartfelt laughs – I hope we will see each other again soon. Jørgen, Anja, and everyone else, thank you for being there for me. Fare thee well, my friends, and fare thee **well.**

## Table of contents

<b>1 Introduction</b> .....	1
<b>2 Theoretical orientation</b> .....	4
<b>2.2 Politeness theory</b> .....	11
2.2.1 Leech’s politeness principle and Goffman’s concept of ‘face’ .....	11
2.2.2 Brown and Levinson’s FTA theory .....	14
<b>2.3 Pragmatic competence: acquisition, transfer and development</b> .....	18
<b>3 Methodology</b> .....	21
<b>3.1 Exploratory research</b> .....	21
<b>3.2 Data-collection through DCTs</b> .....	22
<b>3.3 Data-collection through interviews</b> .....	25
<b>3.4 Participants</b> .....	26
<b>3.5 Data collection considerations and procedure</b> .....	27
3.5.1 Interview considerations .....	28
3.5.2 Data collection procedure .....	29
<b>3.6 Data analysis tools</b> .....	30
<b>3.7 Research validity, reliability, and ethical considerations</b> .....	33
<b>4 Results</b> .....	37
<b>4.1 Interview results</b> .....	37
4.1.1 Question one: immediate thoughts on pragmatic competence .....	37
4.1.2 Question two: relevance of pragmatic competence .....	39
4.1.3 Question three: current focus on teaching pragmatic competence .....	41
4.1.4 Question four: how pragmatic competence is taught .....	42
4.1.5 Question five: rough estimate of time spent teaching pragmatic competence .....	44
4.1.6 Question six: final or concluding thoughts .....	45
<b>4.2 DCT results</b> .....	46
4.2.1 Scenario 1: Asking to borrow a textbook from the teacher .....	46
4.2.2 Scenario 2: Asking a stranger for directions .....	48
4.2.3 Scenario 3: Asking a friend for a loan .....	49
4.2.4 Scenario 4: Asking a neighbour to talk more quietly on the phone .....	50
4.2.5: Scenario 5: Asking for an extra day or two to finish an assignment .....	51
4.2.6: Scenario 6: Asking a stranger to move his or her bag on the bus .....	53
<b>5 Discussion</b> .....	54
<b>6 Conclusion</b> .....	63
<b>6.1 Suggestions for further research</b> .....	64

<b>References</b> .....	65
<b>Appendix A: Interview guide</b> .....	70
<b>Appendix B: Discourse completion task (DCT)</b> .....	71
<b>Appendix C1: Interview 1 transcription</b> .....	72
<b>Appendix C3: Interview 3 transcription</b> .....	89
<b>Appendix C4: Interview 4 transcription</b> .....	93
<b>Appendix C5: Interview 5 transcription</b> .....	98
<b>Appendix C6: Interview 6 transcription</b> .....	102
<b>Appendix C7: Interview 7 transcription</b> .....	107
<b>Appendix C8: Interview 8 transcription</b> .....	117
<b>Appendix C9: Interview 9 transcription</b> .....	123
<b>Appendix C10: Interview 10 transcription</b> .....	127

## **List of abbreviations**

CP: Co-operative principle

DCT: Discourse completion task

(D): Social distance

EFL: English as foreign language

FTA: Face-threatening acts

*H*: Hearer

IFIDs: Illocutionary force indicators

L1: First language

L2: Second language

(P): Relative power

PP: Politeness principle

(R): Degree of imposition

*S*: Speaker

# 1 Introduction

The current study seeks to investigate how pragmatics and the development of pragmatic competence in 16-17-year-old pupils are addressed in Norwegian English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms at the upper secondary level. It means to ascertain whether pragmatics is taught implicitly or explicitly, in addition to seeking an assertion of Norwegian EFL teachers' current opinions on the relevance of developing pragmatic competence. Pragmatic competence may be broadly understood as an awareness of how language use is context-dependent, i.e. it varies between cultures, and that language must be adapted to the needs of the situation (Norenberg 2017).

The current study makes use of interviews and discourse completion tasks (DCTs), the latter being a form of language test developed to measure pragmalinguistic competence; pupils are prompted to elicit requests in their target language (L2) based on situational descriptions. The pupils' responses are then viewed in combination with the teacher interviews to ascertain pragmatics' current position. Three research questions are addressed in the current study:

1. How is pragmatic competence taught in Norwegian EFL classrooms in the programme for general studies?
2. What are the teacher attitudes towards teaching pragmatic competence?
3. How do the pupils modify their L2 written requests?

Prior research conducted on EFL pupils' pragmalinguistic competence have found that pragmatics receives little to no direct, explicit attention in EFL contexts. Instead, lessons in EFL focus on development of, for example, grammar and correct syntax (Amaya 2008). There is significant international research on perceptions of pragmatics and its teaching in other countries. By contrast, pragmatics research in Norway is lacking.

Among the key contributors of pragmatics research in Norway are e.g. Norenberg (2017), Brubæk (2012; 2013), Johansen (2008), Fretheim (2005) and Gray (2005). Fretheim and Gray investigated how Norwegian politeness norms compare to other language contexts, e.g. English. Norenberg, Brubæk and Johansen focused on asserting Norwegian EFL pupils' pragmatic competence, and pragmatics' position. Their data revealed a need to make pragmatics more explicitly addressed in Norwegian EFL instructional settings, as the pupils' competence was found to be limited. Explained in brief, the pupils were unable to correctly



adapt their language use to the needs of the situation, and their target language use was found to be different from native speakers' use of English.

English is increasingly used in Norwegian work places. This increased use stresses the argument for a better developed pragmatic competence (LK06 2013). Other language users of English have their own views and conventions of appropriate language use in different contexts (Leech 2014). While it is unrealistic that Norwegian EFL pupils are familiarised with appropriate language use in several other language contexts, the increased use of English and exposure to other cultures in Norwegian work places suggests a need for the pupils to at least be sensitive to and aware of cultural differences in appropriate language use. As the Norwegian Knowledge Promotion Reform (LK06) expresses:

To succeed in a world where English is used for international communication, it is necessary to be able to use the English language and to have knowledge of how it is used in different contexts. Thus, we need to develop a vocabulary and skills in using the systems of the English language [...]

(LK06: 1)

While syntactic knowledge is important, The Norwegian Knowledge Promotion Reform recognises that successful communication hinges also on the learner's ability to adapt his or her language use. Failure to adapt one's language, or a lack of understanding of other cultures' conventions of language use can have unintended consequences, such as conflicts, embarrassment or misunderstandings (Kasper and Rose 2002). One example of a misunderstanding due to a lack of understanding of cultural differences, and the consequences, is presented by Suryoputro and Suyatno (2017):

After a two-hour walk around the monument, the tourist and the student had a rest at one of coffee shops close to it. As soon as they sat down, the tourist asked, "You like to have a drink" to the student. "No, thanks," the student replied. Due to the student's response, the tourist only ordered and enjoyed the drink for himself, while the student wished he was offered again to have a drink. Why did the student say, "No, Thanks?" This happens since in his culture, it is considered impolite to say "Yes" at first hand when offered something to drink. By contrast, the tourist thought that the student refused his offer.

(Suryoputro and Suyatno 2017: 53)

Globalisation, social media and online communication further enables Norwegian EFL learners to communicate with native speakers directly (Norenberg 2017). Norwegians and the Norwegian language (L1) were found by Gray (2005) and Fretheim (2005) to be relatively cold compared to e.g. English. Short phrases, such as ‘kan du hjelpe meg?’ (‘can you help me?’) are considered sufficiently polite in Norway, whereas they would not be considered polite if used when speaking to a native speaker of English.

As exemplified by Suryoputro and Suyatno (2017) above, simple rituals such as refusals, accepting and greeting can be completely opposite to what a language user is used to in his or her native language (L1). In other words, there is a significant risk of Norwegians being perceived as rude in written and oral communication, unless they are taught to be aware of the differences in what is deemed as contextually appropriate in L2 (Norenberg 2017).

Chapter 2 outlines the theoretical framework of the current thesis through an assertion of different definitions of pragmatics, and language concepts within pragmatics research such as speech acts and implicature. Chapter 3 presents and describes the methodology for answering the current study’s research questions, and the results are presented in chapter 4. Combined with terms and theories from chapter 2, chapter 5 discusses and uses the results to answer the three research questions presented above. Finally, chapter 6 concludes this thesis through a summary of essential findings, and suggestions for further research.

## 2 Theoretical orientation

This chapter introduces the theoretical framework of the current thesis, through a definition of some of the central terms and theories in pragmatics research. Following the publication of Levinson's *Pragmatics* (1983), pragmatics established itself as one of the core components of linguistic theory, now far too wide to be covered by any one book (Huang 2014: 5) - a stark contrast to how it was initially viewed and treated as the linguistic "[...] rag-bag into which recalcitrant data could be conveniently stuffed" (Leech 1983: 1).

Because of the relatively narrow scope of the present study, the select few terms and theories reflect but a small piece of an otherwise vast linguistic field with subjects both influenced by and influencing disciplines outside of linguistic research, such as informatics, neuroscience and sociology (Huang 2014: 1). Section 2.1 defines and elaborates the terms pragmatics, speech acts and pragmatic competence. These terms are further discussed in connection to politeness theory in section 2.2. Section 2.3, inspired by the research results of Brubæk (2012), Savic (2014) and Trosborg (1995), introduces the term pragmatic transfer and its potential for disrupting or facilitating successful communication in a target language.

### 2.1 Pragmatics

There exists not one, but several possible definitions of pragmatics. One broad, general definition gives some impression of the numerous potential focal points of pragmatics (Levinson 1983: 5), stating that pragmatics "[...] is the study of language in use" (Huang 2014: 1). However, what kind of language, whether it is oral or written, and when, why and by whom it is used, is not explained. While still vague and therefore difficult to employ to answer the research questions of the current thesis, Leech (1983: 6) defines pragmatics slightly more specifically as "[...] the study of meaning in relation to speech situations". Leech's definition provides an example of how pragmatics differs from semantics, and why, as e.g. Johansen (2008) argues, the two linguistic fields of semantics and pragmatics are often kept separate.

A semantic definition of meaning may be understood as a set of expressions and utterances that are mere abstractions isolated from actual language use in context (Leech 1983: 6), for example what the word 'hello' means. From a pragmatic viewpoint, on the other hand, meaning hinges upon its users rather than fixed rules, e.g. what did the person mean by

saying 'hello'? Was it a mere greeting, a warning, or an attempt at capturing someone's attention? Pragmatics, as opposed to semantics, is in other words more closely associated with viewing language as action and performance instead of some non-interactive, rule-governed system (Leech 1983: 21).

The speech situation referred to in Leech's definition of pragmatics above contains five elements for study: an addresser and addressee, a context, one or more goals, the illocutionary act, and an utterance (Leech 1983: 15). Given that pragmatics research examines meaning developed through concrete use of language, the studied language situation necessarily contains an addresser and an addressee; someone speaking or writing, and a recipient of the written or oral production. These two participants, the addresser and addressee, are often simply referred to as a speaker and a hearer, interlocutors, or merely *S* and *H* (Leech: 1983).

These interlocutors' occurring speech situation is bound to a context, i.e. a specific time and place, where the speaker has one or more goals in mind. For example, the speaker wants to borrow a book from the hearer. This goal is reached through the illocutionary act, also known as the illocution, or speech act (three terms that will be used interchangeably in the current thesis), "the uttering of a linguistic expression whose function is not just to say things but actively to do things or to perform acts as well" (Huang 2007: 284). Lastly, the utterance, known also as the locution, is the actual spoken linguistic expression, the sentence product, of the illocutionary act.

Returning to the example of the speaker's goal above might help distinguish the locution, the mouthing of words, from the illocutionary act: *S* wants to borrow a book from *H*, and s/he asks: 'may I borrow your book?' The actual words produced by *S* and heard by *H* form the locution (Searle 1974: 24), and locutions may be realised in a great number of ways, for example 'may I borrow your book', 'please lend me your book', or 'could I borrow that which you read?' Though the formulations and word order may vary, the illocution remains a request; the speaker's goal is to borrow the hearer's book.

Speech act theory is commonly attributed to Austin, whose framework is later developed by his pupil, John R. Searle (Huang 2007: 93). Prior to the development of Austin's speech act theory, "[...] language was viewed as the giving and receiving of information and the expressing of statements" (Johansen 2008: 9-10). What was communicated could be judged to be either true or false, a notion today known as the descriptive fallacy (Huang 2007: 94). This fallacy stems from a philosophy prevalent in the

1930s called logical positivism, a school of thought that viewed unverifiable statements (i.e. anything but true or false information) as meaningless.

Austin challenged this philosophy, arguing that, during conversation, when a speaker says something, s/he is at the same time performing an unfalsifiable action (Searle 1974: 22-23). Huang (2007: 94) lists three examples of unfalsifiable utterances:

- (1): Good morning!
- (2): Is she a vegetarian?
- (3): Put the car in the garage, please.

Looking at these three utterances, the greeting, question and request, Austin's argument that language is more than a question of truth-conditional assertion is made clear – after all, how could someone claim that a e.g. the question is false? However, if the question instead had been reformulated and employed as a statement, i.e. 'she is a vegetarian', it could be proven true or false (Huang 2007).

Austin continues his argument against logical positivism by differentiating between two primary types of utterances: performatives and constatives. A few examples of performatives include commanding, requesting, apologizing, approving, promising and arguing (Searle 1974: 23) such as 'I demand that you come here', 'I promise to be there at eight O'clock', 'sorry!' or 'go away!'.

Constatives are on the other hand used to make assertions or statements (Huang 2007: 95), e.g. 'the Norwegian king's name is Harald', 'the earth is round', or 'Neil Armstrong was the first man on the moon'. Moreover, these constatives appear to be in line with the logical positivists' philosophy of falsification. This might have been the case during the inception of Austin's theory.

However, Austin later revised the concept of constatives after noting that the degree of truth in any statement was often a rough approximation. For example, stating 'the earth is only more or less round' is more correct than 'the earth is round' (Huang 2007: 101). Moreover, he found that several constatives were, to some extent, performatives. Adding the adverb 'hereby' to for example the assertion 'Peter is tall', i.e. 'I hereby state that Peter is tall', changes the constative into an unfalsifiable type of performative despite how the utterance is being used descriptively (Huang 2007: 96).

Performatives are further divided into two categories: explicit performatives and implicit performatives (Huang 2007: 96). Explicit performatives are signalled by the

utterance's use of a performative verb, for example 'to name' in 'I name this city Stavanger', and often in combination with the use of subject personal pronouns such as 'I', 'you', and 'we'. Implicit performatives contain no performative verbs. Examples include, for example, 'go, now!', 'I did not think we would be here for so long', or 'are you free next Tuesday?'. The qualities of implicit performatives suggest that the meaning of illocutionary acts, or performative utterances, is not always obvious to the hearer. As a result, the hearer must interpret, and context analyse what is said to ascertain the meaning of the illocutionary act (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989: 280).

The meaning, or goal of the illocutionary act, is called illocutionary force (Leech 1983: 15) and is indicated and interpreted by illocutionary force indicators (IFIDs); the utterance's stress, intonation, word order, verb tenses and employment of performative verbs (Searle 1974: 30). A speaker's employment of performative verbs is perhaps the most explicit indicator of an illocutionary force, e.g. by stating 'I request your aid', or 'I demand to see the manager'. On the other end of the scale, the illocutionary force of saying e.g. 'I need help with this task', may be realised less explicitly through implicit performatives (Huang 2007), by uttering 'this task is giving me a headache'.

Additionally, Searle (1974) argues that the context in which an illocutionary act is performed will sometimes be enough to reveal the illocutionary force. One example might involve a teacher asking the pupils in his or her class whether someone would like to read a passage aloud from their textbook. Being familiar with the classroom context, the pupils understand they are not just asked a polar yes-no question, but also to proceed to read a passage.

In those instances where there is a clear link between the sentence type, e.g. a directive as in 'turn up the radio's volume' and the illocutionary force, the result is a direct speech act. When there is no such link between the sentence type and illocutionary force, the result becomes an indirect speech act (Huang 2007: 110), for example by using an interrogative, as in 'can you hand me the pencil?'. Direct and indirect speech acts are further outlined in section 2.2.2.

Speech act theory, as presented by Searle (1974), Huang (2007) and Leech (1983) are compiled in Crystal's definition of pragmatics: "[...] the study of language from the point of view of users, especially 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" (2008: 379). This example elaborates Leech's (1983) definition,

arguing that communication impacts both the speaker and the listener, and in what way different strategies in different contexts shapes the meaning of different speech situations.

Crystal's (2008) additional emphasis on the effects of language use introduces the term perlocutionary effect, sometimes called the uptake (Cohen 2010: 6); the consequences or effects of an utterance on the addressee (Levinson 1983: 237). The perlocutionary effect of uttering 'it is a bit chilly in here', might be that someone turns on an oven or shuts an open window. Searle provides some other examples. For example, by arguing, one may persuade another to do something, or by uttering a warning, the hearer's reaction is to be alarmed (1974: 25). This effect, according to Austin, constitutes the final element of performing a speech act (Huang 2007: 102). Summarized, the three components of a speech act (Huang 2007: 102); the locution, illocutionary act and perlocutionary effect demonstrates how, in short, pragmatics becomes "[...] the study of people's comprehension and production of linguistic action in context" (Kasper and Blum-Kulka 1993: 3).

The comprehension and production of linguistic action in context is problematized by an important point: several speech acts are situated, i.e. bound to specific contexts. Not all speech acts are directly transferable between cultures and communities (Huang 2007: 119). Such differences in cultural patterns of speech act production may be studied through a cross-cultural lens (e.g. Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper 1989), by for example looking at apologetic performative utterances in English compared to Danish.

Other studies conducted by e.g. Brubæk (2012) and Trosborg (1995), found that learners of a target language perform speech acts in the target language that differ from those performed by the native speakers of that specific target language – and the learner's speech acts may have unintended perlocutionary effects. This examination of learners of a second language is known as interlanguage research, where interlanguage is the English produced by e.g. a Norwegian learner of English. Interlanguage may further be understood as the learner's current stage on a ladder to higher language competence (Huang 2007: 125).

Given that speech act patterns are sometimes situated, there must also exist certain conventions, or social norms, determining the appropriateness or correctness of any speech act (Searle 1974: 45). For instance, an American might greet a Norwegian learner of English with a casual 'how are you?', which the Norwegian then interprets as an inquiry into his or her well-being. The Norwegian therefore initiates a lengthy elaboration of how terrible the week has been, and how much s/he resents someone. The American, on the other hand, had only the intention of greeting the other person, but is instead stuck in an awkward situation (Røkaas 2000).

How the different speech acts are produced and understood rely on both the speaker and the hearer's pragmatic competence, broadly defined as the appropriate use of language in different social contexts (Taguchi 2009: 1). Pragmatic competence may be divided into two components: illocutionary and sociolinguistic competence (Bachman 1990). Illocutionary competence is an individual's knowledge of the correct way to perform certain language functions (Bachman 1990: 90) e.g. knowledge of the correct way to make a request, an apology or a demand as well as the number of ways in which they may be realised.

The sociolinguistic competence is the individual's ability to perform these language functions in a way that is appropriate to the current context s/he is in (Bachman 1990: 94), which might involve realizing a request instead of a demand when needing help from someone whose social status is perceived to be above the speaker's. For example, an employee of a company wants a raise, but must first determine the correct speech act. Then s/he must decide whether it is a good idea to execute it – after all, the boss' impression of the employee is at stake.

The importance of developing one's pragmatic competence further becomes clear based on Levinson's (1983: 17) argument on how there are sometimes differences between speaker-meaning and sentence-meaning; how quickly misunderstandings arise from the production of inferences. These inferences are known as the notion of conversational implicature. Conversational implicature (or: implicature) is a notion suggesting it is possible to “[...] to mean (in some general sense) more than what is actually ‘said’” (Levinson 1983: 97). While demonstrating implicature, pragmatics' separation from semantics is additionally made clearer by following Levinson's (1983: 97) example:

A: Can you tell me the time?

B: Well, the milkman has come

The semantic and literal explanation of the two phrases above indicate that A only asks if B has the ability to tell A the time. A semantic interpretation of B's utterance is that the milkman arrived at some point before A and B's conversation. However, a pragmatic interpretation of the two utterances provides more details: A also wants B to actually tell A the time (if B knows it), and even if B does not know what time it is, A might be able to deduce the hour based on the information that the milkman has arrived (Levinson 1983: 98). Furthermore, B's use of the discourse particle 'well' (Crystal 2008: 379) is through the pragmatic lens understood to serve as an indication that a speaker does not possess the full



information that A requires (Levinson 1983: 162), something the literal, semantic interpretation cannot convey.

Consider another example: A, the speaker, utters ‘this movie rocks’ ironically and intends to convey A’s boredom to B, in hope of changing the movie or stopping its screening, despite how, semantically, the literal interpretation of the utterance states the contrary. Additionally, by angrily uttering ‘good day’ A’s intention is to signal that A has had enough of B’s presence. The uptake, or perlocutionary effect of such an utterance may be unproblematic when engaged with those familiar with the conventions for use of those phrases – B leaves. However, as Cohen (2010) argues, problems are nevertheless quick to arise. If B is, for example, of young age, or an EFL pupil at a low interlanguage level, B might not understand what A’s utterance infers, which will in turn only frustrate and further anger A (Cohen 2010: 6).

Levinson (1983) points to Grice’s (1975) theory of the co-operative principle to provide an example of the language mechanisms behind implicature. Grice’s co-operative principle expresses: “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” (1975: 45). This principle is comprised from a set of four maxims: quantity, quality, relation and manner (see e.g. Huang 2007 for a simplified version or Grice 1975 for a detailed account of these maxims).

Explained in short, these maxims claim that interlocutors must unambiguously speak the truth, in a way the other person understands, without providing more information than what is relevant and necessary to co-operate in maintaining successful communication (Levinson 1983: 102). While this is perhaps unrealistic in most language situations, people nevertheless adhere to this principle to some degree during conversation.

The adherence to this principle is demonstrated by examining the previously presented example of A asking B for the time. B fails to provide an unambiguous and sufficiently clear answer according to Grice’s principle. However, “inferences arise to preserve the assumption of co-operation” (Levinson 1983: 102), both interlocutors either consciously or unconsciously draw inferences from each other’s statements to understand what is conveyed, thereby co-operating to ensure effective communication. Huang provides an example of how this principle helps interlocutors understand irony: To adhere to the co-operative principle when a speaker says something the hearer knows is inherently false, the hearer assumes the speaker’s utterance is contrary to what is meant (Huang 2007: 30).

However, as Cohen (2010) argues, there are occasions where interlocutors fail to uphold effective communication. If implicature has such a potential for misunderstandings and conflict, why do language users embroider their utterances with ambiguity and veiled intentions? As Huang (2007: 115) suggests, one possible “[...] answer is that the use of indirect speech acts is in general associated with politeness [...] the more indirect a speech act, the more polite”. In other words, the inherent indirectness of implicature is the result of the interlocutors’ attempts at sounding polite while adhering to the co-operative principle.

A similar argument is made by Johansen: “[Politeness] can be seen as a way of explaining the need for indirectness” (2008: 21). Consequently, the development of pragmatic competence among learners of a target language is concerned with the learner’s ability to draw information from inferences in a target language, and politeness issues; the realisation of contextually appropriate and lexically functional speech acts, which will be explored in the following section below.

## **2.2 Politeness theory**

While pragmatics is already a sizeable branch of linguistics, its connections to politeness is, as Huang (2007: 115) states, covered by an extensive amount of literature. This sentiment is supported by Leech, who argues that it is “virtually impossible” for a single book to cover all topics on politeness (2014: ix). The following section will cover those theories presented by e.g. Huang (2007) and Kasper and Rose (2002), who count these among the most central and influential theories on the topic of politeness. However, there are consequently other potentially relevant terms and theories that are excluded from the current thesis. The covered theories will include a brief assertion of important criticisms, followed by a reasoning for why, despite the criticism, the theories are considered relevant and applicable.

### **2.2.1 Leech’s politeness principle and Goffman’s concept of ‘face’**

Grice’s co-operative principle (henceforth abbreviated CP) and conversational implicature cannot, according to Leech (1983: 80), by themselves account for indirectness in conversation, nor the relation between what is meant and what is said. Leech introduces the politeness principle (PP) to address this issue. PP may be understood as an argument that different speech situations call for certain kinds and degrees of politeness. Leech demonstrates

this argument by pointing to four general functions of illocutionary acts: competitive, convivial, collaborative and conflictive (Leech 1983: 104). These four functions are based on to what extent they establish and maintain comity during discourse. The final two functions are those least associated with politeness and maintaining comity and will therefore only be covered in brief.

Collaborative illocutionary functions involve e.g. neutral assertions and reports, whereas conflictive illocutionary functions are inherently impolite and meant to cause offense, involving threats and reprimands (Leech 1983: 104). Collaborative and conflictive illocutionary functions are therefore rarely connected with indirectness in conversation. The competitive illocutionary functions are associated with e.g. making requests and giving commands, while convivial illocutionary functions are “intrinsically courteous” (Leech 1983: 105), speech acts involving giving praise, thanking or greeting someone. Among the four functions, the competitive functions call for a greater need of indirectness and politeness (Leech 1983).

As cross-cultural and interlanguage research as shown (e.g. Félix-Brasdefer 2012 and Taguchi 2009), views on politeness is a matter of individual, subjective opinions and societal norms; “[...] what is polite with respects to *[H]* or some third party will be impolite with respect to *[S]*, and vice versa” (Leech 1983: 107). Without dismissing the role of societal norms, indirect illocutionary acts are generally viewed as being more polite than direct illocutionary acts (Huang 2007: 118).

A part of the reason for viewing indirect illocutions (indirectness+) as more polite (politeness+) stems from the reduction of their illocutionary force, and therefore an increase in the hearer’s optionality (Leech 1983: 108). Consider the following request examples belonging to Leech’s competitive illocutionary functions:

- (1): Open the door
- (2): Can you open the door?
- (3): Could you possibly open the door?

Based on the logic of indirectness+ = politeness+, the third option will in most situations be viewed as most polite in realisations of competitive illocutionary functions (Leech 1983: 108), since the implicature, the inferred meaning, is different from what is said. This allows for the utterance to be interpreted in more than one way.

However, there are two additional factors which contribute to the degree of and need for politeness: the cost-benefit scale (Leech 1983: 107) and the degree of interactivity between the interlocutors. If the request is to the speaker's benefit, the request is generally considered less polite than if it is to the hearer's benefit. To adhere to Leech's PP (1983: 132), *S* must seek to minimize the cost and maximise the benefit to *H*, while simultaneously maximizing cost and minimizing benefit to *S*. For example, 'please help yourself to another cookie' is considered to be more polite than 'please hand me another cookie', because the former benefits the hearer, despite how both requests call for some form of action from the hearer.

The degree of interactivity varies between types of discourse. For example, a professor sharing information with students is less interactive than ordinary conversations between two people, where *S* and *H* take turns between acting as the speaker or hearer (Trosborg 1995: 31). This interactivity sometimes leads to unexpected and paradoxical pragmatic situations, situations which Leech calls a "[...] comedy of inaction" (1983: 112).

Such a paradox may be demonstrated by returning to the example given above, where *S* asks *H* to open the door. Imagine that *H* simultaneously wants *S* to open the door, i.e. *H* issues the same request as *S*. The hypothetical consequence is two people both wanting the other person to open the door. However, in order to reduce the cost to the other, both proceed to attempt to open the door at the same time, which results in a deadlocked situation, or a tug of war, where neither succeeds in being polite.

At the heart of the interlocutors' adherence to both PP and CP lies Goffman's concept of face, the "[...] positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact [...] an image others may share [...]" (1967: 5). Huang summarizes this definition as a person's self-esteem (2007: 116), and this self-esteem is at risk during face-to-face interactions with other people.

Goffman studies these face-to-face encounters as expressions of cultural rituals; the types of activities in which participants of a society engage in during daily activities. All participants engaged in some form of cultural ritual, e.g. everyday conversation, run the risk of having their self-esteem, or face, damaged. If the discourse sustains the interlocutors' face, e.g. by falling into the same category as Leech's neutral collaborative illocutionary functions or convivial illocutionary functions, there is little risk of conflict (Goffman 1967). The conflictive illocutionary functions are perhaps the most obvious examples of potential for inflicting damage to *H*'s face, since e.g. being offended will likely result in a harmed self-image and negative feelings.

Solving politeness issues is concerned with observing *H*'s reactions and self-image as a means to maintain effective communication (Leech 1983: 133). Leech later calls this observance of *H*'s reactions as a form of altruism: without observing the face of those engaged in conversation, the act of communication would effectively break apart (2014: 23). Consequently, the participants of conversation adhere to the others' face either consciously or un-consciously to achieve their own goals (Goffman 1967: 29), becoming what Johansen (2008: 22) calls 'social operators' – interlocutors who through use of language ensure social stability.

Leech's PP has received a fair deal of criticism. The criticism of PP was concerned with the treatment of politeness as a set of absolute values, based on how Leech (1983) argued for a step-by-step increase in politeness utterances, culminating in a most polite utterance. For example, 'thank you very much' is more polite than 'thank you'. However, Leech later revised his theory, stating that "[...] there is no such thing as a polite utterance out of its context" (Leech 2014: 15) – the context is what determines the appropriateness of an utterance. Consider this example: the utterance 'thank you very much' is further embroidered by saying 'thank you so, very, very, very much'. In certain circumstances, the latter utterance could be considered too polite or servile (Leech 2014: 17). Consider another example:

A: I am afraid you will have to wait in line.

B: Thank you very much!

Drawn from the theory of absolute politeness, B is being polite towards A. However, with Leech's (2014) revision, B's utterance can be considered both sarcastic and impolite. The implicature of B's utterance is that B is impatient and therefore bothered by being asked by A to wait, which with appliance of IFIDs would be further indicated by the stress and intonation of the utterance (Searle 1974). Instead of a most polite utterance, Leech admitted politeness may be viewed as a continuum, resulting in degrees of politeness, rather than absolute politeness.

### 2.2.2 Brown and Levinson's FTA theory

Brown and Levinson (1987) developed Goffman's concept of face, creating one of the most commonly applied and influential politeness theories in pragmatics research (Huang 2007: 116; Savic 2014: 20). Srisuruk (2011) applied Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory

in a similar study to the current thesis, when investigating pragmatic competence in Thai speakers of English. Koike (1989) utilized elements of the politeness theory to explain development of interlanguage speech act patterns in North-American adult learners of Spanish as L2.

Face, according to Brown and Levinson (1987), is comprised of two halves: positive face and negative face. Positive face refers to an individual's self-esteem, his or her desire to be liked, approved of, and recognised as competent and valuable. Negative face, on the other hand, refers to an individual's right to freedom of action, and to not be hindered or imposed on by someone else (Huang 2007: 116). Brown and Levinson named these desires face wants (1987: 62).

During conversation, every utterance potentially risks harming or maintaining the faces wants of the interlocutors (Brown and Levinson 1987). Consider an example where A asks B for a lift into town. A asking B for a lift into town is a threat to B's negative face, since the request is contrary to B's desire to be unimpeded. B, who is bothered by A's request, responds with a verbal insult, calling A by a derogatory term, e.g. lazy. B's response is thus a threat to A's positive face, since A's perception of him- or herself is damaged.

As Goffman (1967) argued, interlocutors are interested in preserving each other's faces – and *S* will therefore seek to avoid damaging *H*'s face. However, like the example above suggests, there are situations where the interlocutors do not intend to avoid damage to *H*'s face, or where such damage is unavoidable. Brown and Levinson saw that certain acts carried out in conversations are intrinsically face-threatening, i.e. always representing a threat to either the other's positive or negative face. Face-threatening acts (FTAs) that demand some action from *H*, such as requests, reminders, suggestions and threats intrinsically damage *H*'s negative face (Brown and Levinson 1987: 65-66). FTAs involving criticisms, insults, disagreements, complaints will intrinsically threaten *H*'s positive face (Brown and Levinson 1987: 66).

Whether and how *S* carries out an FTA relies on three key factors: the social distance (D) between *S* and *H*, the relative power (P) between *S* and *H*, and the degree of the FTAs imposition (R) (Brown and Levinson 1987: 74). These values are not absolutes. D, P and R are based solely on how the interlocutors mutually determine them, rather than being determined by “[...] *sociologists*' ratings of *actual* power, distance, etc. [...]” (Brown and Levinson 1987: 74).

The weightiness (W) of an FTA ( $x$ ) may be better demonstrated using Brown and Levinson's FTA formula:  $W_x = D(S, H) + P(H, S) + R_x$  (1987: 76). These factors are

measured on a scale from 1 to  $n$ , where  $n$  is “[...] some small number” (Brown and Levinson 1987: 76). If the summative value of these factors is mutually determined by the interlocutors to be high, there is a low chance that the FTA will be carried out, and vice versa if the summative value is determined to be low. In other words, the summative value will determine the effort required, or the face-work needed, to preserve  $H$ 's face.

Brown and Levinson (1987) presents five strategies for doing an FTA, based on the estimated risk of face loss.  $S$ 's first choice is whether to do the FTA. If  $W_x$  is high,  $S$  may instead choose not to do the FTA. If  $S$  goes through with the FTA,  $S$  has two choices: realising the FTA on record or off record. Doing the FTA off record involves doing it indirectly (Huang 2007: 118), to the extent where the intent is not immediately apparent from the locution.

A high degree of implicature (Levinson 1983) serves as one example of an off record FTA:  $S$  drops a hint which infers  $S$ 's goal to borrow money from  $H$ . For instance,  $S$  utters ‘I am a little tight on cash these days’. However, the meaning of the utterance may be negotiated, since there is “[...] more than one unambiguously attributable intention” (Brown and Levinson 1987: 69), and  $S$  therefore has a way to remove the face-threat to  $H$ 's face if  $H$  is offended or bothered by the inferred request.

When an FTA is done on record, there is no unambiguous intention behind e.g. a request;  $H$  knows  $S$  needs something from  $H$ , which is made clear from the locution, for instance by uttering “I need to borrow some money from you.” Furthermore, when doing the FTA on record, it is either done baldly (without redressive action) or with redressive action. Baldly realising an FTA “[...] involves doing it in the most direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way possible [...]” (Brown and Levinson 1987: 69), for example uttering ‘come here!’ instead of ‘could you please come here?’

While bald FTA strategies adhere to Grice's (1975) CP by communicating  $S$ 's intent in a clear manner, they potentially violate Leech's (1983) PP if the conversation context warrants a certain degree of politeness, for instance when making a request. For example, if  $S$  and  $H$  are not friends, and  $H$ 's relative power is above  $S$ 's,  $S$  should instead choose to carry out the FTA with redressive action, even in those cases where the degree of imposition is mutually considered low. Brown and Levinson describe redressive action thusly:

By redressive action we mean action that ‘gives face’ to the addressee, that is, that attempts to counteract the potential face damage of the FTA by doing it in such a way, or with such modifications or additions, that indicate clearly that no such face threat is

intended or desired, and that *S* in general recognizes *H*'s face wants and himself wants them to be achieved.

(Brown and Levinson 1987: 69-70)

If *H*'s negative face is threatened, the situation warrants negative politeness, usually involving showing deference and apologizing for the imposition caused by *S*'s speech act. On the other hand, if *H*'s positive face is threatened, *S* may instead choose to emphasize *H*'s good qualities, that they are equal in terms of social standing and rank, or e.g. through a reassurance of how much *S* likes *H* (Huang 2007: 116).

However, as Brown and Levinson state, “[t]here is a natural tension in negative politeness [...] between (a) the desire to go on record as a prerequisite [...] to pay face, and (b) the desire to go off record to avoid imposing” (1987: 70). As a result, FTAs involving requests and impacting *H*'s negative face usually involve conventionalized indirectness; indirect utterances that have been conventionalized within a culture or between two interlocutors, and no longer have off record or alternative interpretations. For example, requests such as ‘can you give me the time?’ or ‘can you give me a hand?’ This phrasing shows that *S* is aware of *H*'s face wants, and wants to see them maintained to some degree (Brown and Levinson 1987: 71).

While Brown and Levinson's (1987) FTA theory is commonly used, it is simultaneously a victim of criticism. The chief criticism concerns its apparent universality. Brown and Levinson (1987) claim their FTA framework is applicable in all cultures, even if different cultures attribute different emphasis to the variables *D*, *P* and *R*. However, this argument demonstrates a western bias, and that FTA theory's emphasis on individual factors neglects how other cultures are more concerned with preservation of a collective face (Huang 2007: 119). Furthermore, Taguchi (2009) states that Japanese speakers are not only focused on preserving face, but honorifics as well, i.e. understood as *S*'s social standing. This social standing is what determines *S*'s request repertoire, and the appropriate use of e.g. request strategies rather than an emphasis on maintaining *H*'s face.

Despite the western bias, Brown and Levinson's (1987) FTA theory provides a helpful framework for examining pragmatic competence in learners of a target language. For example, Trosborg (1995) argues that EFL learners' move towards use of conventional indirectness demonstrates increased pragmatic competence. Johansen (2008) found the concept of face and FTA framework useful when comparing gratitude expressions of Norwegian EFL learners to native speakers of English, demonstrating differences in their



choice of strategies. Savic (2014) similarly and more recently employs FTA theory to demonstrate differences in e.g. patterns of request strategies between native speakers of English and Serbian EFL learners.

### **2.3 Pragmatic competence: acquisition, transfer and development**

Alasadi (2012) argues that EFL learners who demonstrate highly developed skills in e.g. grammar, syntax or phonology, do not necessarily possess equally developed pragmatic skills. Despite performing speech acts which are grammatically and phonetically correct and understood, EFL learners with underdeveloped pragmatic competence will often come across as rude, abrupt or unfeeling to native speakers (Alasadi 2012: 26). Consequently, Alasadi (2012) and other linguistic researchers (e.g. Rajabia, Azizifara and Gowhary 2015, Brubæk 2012 and Deda 2013) call for increased focus on explicit instruction of L2 pragmatics and developing EFL learners' pragmatic competence.

However, the teachability of pragmatic competence has been questioned. One issue stems from a simplification of the concept of culture in speech situations. This issue echoes the criticism of Brown and Levinson's (1987) western biased FTA theory, in "[...] that culture is a homogeneous construct [...] all speakers who belong to the same culture adhere to the same 'norm' [...]" (Lenchuk and Ahmed 2014: 85).

In other words, the EFL learners' sociolinguistic competence is a result of instruction based on behaviour thought to apply to all native speakers of a target language. A pedagogical approach therefore risks neglecting variables such as age, social background, occupation, or how minorities in L2 contexts weigh the face threat of various speech acts (Lenchuk and Ahmed 2014).

Another issue arises from an objection to the idea pragmatic competence can be developed within the artificial setting of an EFL classroom. Lenchuk and Ahmed (2014) argue that pragmatics cannot be taught in the same mechanical way as e.g. grammar. Rather than repeating and internalizing a toolset of correct L2 speech acts, attention should be placed on teaching "cultural awareness" (Lenchuk and Ahmed 2014: 85). This cultural awareness is argued to make EFL learners more aware of how contextual factors make certain speech acts appropriate. In turn, an understanding of the concepts of why something is correct will increase a learner's pragmatic fluency at a quicker rate than knowing of correct phrases.

To adhere to teaching cultural awareness, pragmatic instruction might focus on making EFL learners familiar with a range of illocutions, together with examples of some of these illocutions' implementation in different social contexts (Deda 2013). For example, instructors can choose to show examples of conversations and illocutions carried out within different age groups. Moreover, the instructor may then point to how two different age groups have opposing views on what constitutes an appropriate speech act, i.e. how a specific speech act can be considered appropriate within one context, and inappropriate within another, despite how both groups are native speakers.

Kasper (1997) argues that an EFL learner's pragmatic competence is, to some extent, developed by natural exposure to the target language, such by observing implicature in everyday conversation. However, Kasper maintains, like Lenchuk and Ahmed (2014), that explicit instruction nevertheless raises the learners' awareness – thus making them more conscious decision makers, sensitive to how different contexts call for different speech act realisations.

Trosborg (1995) and Woodfield (2012) help present the relevance of conscious use of L2 pragmatics. They argue that EFL users of a target language demonstrate a tendency to transfer their knowledge of appropriate speech acts from their L1 to L2. For example, English native speakers more frequently modify their speech acts with past tense verbs, and negation, e.g. 'you wouldn't be willing to lend me a hand', whereas an EFL learners typically stick to the simple present tense without negation (Woodfield 2012), e.g. 'can you lend me a hand?'.

The transfer of politeness norms from L1 to L2 will sometimes result in what Leech (1983: 231) calls pragmatic failure. However, transfer will not always result in unsuccessful communication. Negative transfer occurs when an EFL learner transfers his or her knowledge of e.g. a correct request in L1 to L2, and the native speaker deems the speech act inappropriate. Positive transfer occurs where the EFL learner transfers "[...] elements which are similar in the two languages [...]" (Trosborg 1995: 466), and which results in what is deemed polite by the native speaker. This transfer sometimes occurs unconsciously, however making learners consciously aware of similarities between e.g. L1 and L2 apology patterns will help speed their pragmatic development.

For example, Kasper (1997) points to how there are similarities between e.g. the modal verb 'could' in Danish and English, which is also the case in Norwegian. 'Kunne du hjælpe meg' directly translates to 'could you help me', i.e. the correct L1 form may be successfully transferred to an L2 context, at least to some degree if the interlocutors are close and the weightiness of the FTA is mutually assumed to be low. This provides a small shortcut

for learning L2 pragmatics. Additionally, in line with Lenchuk and Ahmed's (2014) emphasis on cultural awareness, the instructor may point to why certain speech acts are transferable.

### **3 Methodology**

The present chapter presents and describes the applied methods, materials, research participants, data collection procedures, and data analysis tools used to answer the thesis' research questions: "How is pragmatic competence taught in Norwegian EFL classrooms in the programme for general studies", "what are the teacher attitudes towards teaching pragmatic competence", and "how do pupils modify their L2 requests?". Additionally, it addresses some of the project's ethical considerations and potential issues concerning validity and reliability.

#### **3.1 Exploratory research**

Any research conducted on interlanguage pragmatic performance is either longitudinal, cross-sectional, or a single-moment study (Kasper and Rose 2002). A longitudinal study may be roughly described as "[...] the observation of the same participant(s) over an extended period", for example following the development and use of different reading strategies in a group of school children over the course of a school year. A cross-sectional study involves data-collection from "[...] two (or more) cross-sections of a sample, based, for instance, on differences in level of proficiency in the target language" (Kasper and Rose 2002: 75-76).

The single-moment study is different from the cross-section study in that it does not "collect and compare data from learners at various levels of proficiency" (Kasper and Rose 2002: 79). Lastly, as opposed to a longitudinal study, the participants of a cross-sectional and single-moment study participate only once, which leaves out observation of how e.g. pragmatic competence among a group of pupils develops over time.

The present study may be described as a single-moment study combining both qualitative and quantitative research methods. It may be further defined as exploratory research (Perry 2005: 72); a type of research where the goal is to gain an understanding of some phenomenon, rather than proving or refuting an existing hypothesis (Perry 2005: 80). A chief distinction between qualitative and quantitative research methods is that quantitative research typically involves generalizing findings from selected samples to a larger population, represented by numbers and statistical figures. For example, the research might involve an inquiry of how many novels pupils at a certain age read per year. With qualitative research, the purpose is to uncover new information from a smaller and information-rich sample,

represented by detailed, verbal descriptions (Perry 2005: 75) drawn from patterns in the collected raw data (Seliger and Shohamy 1989: 122). For example, such research might explore factors which motivate and/or hinder autonomous learning in pupils at a lower secondary school. A population may be understood as those whom the research is about, for instance all English teachers in upper secondary school, whereas a sample is the group of people who are actually examined (Dörnyei 2003: 70), e.g. a handful of English teachers from different upper secondary schools in Norway.

Qualitative and quantitative research traditions have long been viewed as being dichotomous; quantitative research is best suited to offer a broad macro-perspective of similar, generalizable characteristics between phenomena, whereas qualitative research can on the other hand elaborate finer nuances and individualities between phenomena through a micro-perspective (Dörnyei 2007: 29). The examples of the general elements of qualitative and quantitative research provided by Dörnyei (2007), Perry (2005) and Seliger and Shohamy (1989) might, to some degree, lend credibility to the dichotomous view. However, are the quantitative and qualitative methods mutually exclusive? Hillocks (2005) argues that they may instead be viewed as complementary; combining methodologies allows for different kinds of evidence and interpretations of the same problem, which in turn serves to strengthen the researcher's case.

This combination of research methods, better known as methodical triangulation (Dörnyei 2007: 42) or mixed-methods research, might for instance involve conducting interviews to explain statistical trends uncovered by a previously distributed questionnaire (or vice-versa). A rough example of methodological triangulation may be demonstrated with a hypothetical situation where observation of a handful of pupils has uncovered that learner autonomy in pupils in lower secondary schools appears to be strengthened by reading novels. Consequently, the researcher chooses to conduct a quantitative inquiry on how many books pupils in lower secondary school read per year through use of a questionnaire. How methodical triangulation might affect the validity of any conducted linguistic research is further outlined in section 3.7.

### **3.2 Data-collection through DCTs**

A discourse completion task (DCT) was used in the present thesis to study sixteen-to-seventeen-year-old Norwegian EFL pupils' interlanguage pragmatic performance in L2.

DCTs are a commonly used data-collection method in pragmatic research. For example, Aufa (2014) examined if and how DCTs could be used as an explicit instruction tool in order to improve EFL pupils' pragmatic competence. Other researchers, e.g. Jebahi (2011) and Kim (2008), have used DCTs as a means to investigate apology speech act strategies among non-native speakers of English. Szczepaniak-Kozak (2015) and Brubæk (2012) employed DCTs to investigate EFL learners request speech acts, and strategies used to mitigate the directness of the requests.

In general, these employed DCTs "[...] require the informant to produce some sort of authentic language data as a response to situational prompts" (Dörnyei 2007: 103). For example, a pupil has forgotten to bring a pen to class and needs to borrow one from a close friend. How does the pupil ask? How does the pupil modify his or her request depending on the request's purpose and context, for instance when borrowing something from a teacher compared to borrowing from a friend? In this regard, the DCTs differ from ordinary questionnaires in that they sample and provide insight into a respondent's language competence, "[...] similar to language tests" (Dörnyei 2007: 103). On the other hand, it resembles a questionnaire's format based on how the DCT allows the researcher to relatively easily quantify data given the relatively short length of the elicited speech acts (Kasper and Rose 2002).

However, given that the responses to the situational prompts are not actual observations of realised, authentic speech acts in non-hypothetical situations, there are certain disadvantages that the researchers should be wary of when distributing the DCT, and afterwards, when analysing the data. These disadvantages include, for example, the simplicity of the questions or prompts, in addition to unreliable and unmotivated responses, and that some pupils might struggle with answering or interpreting the situational prompts (Dörnyei 2003: 10-11).

Furthermore, as pointed out by Kasper and Rose, real life observations would allow the researcher to examine how non-verbal communication, e.g. body language, or elements such as turn taking and tempo influence a conversation arising from natural conditions (2002: 89). Also, when researching language in use, the ideal situation is a natural setting wherein the selected sample has no idea they are being investigated (Seliger and Shohamy 1989: 35). However, as will be argued in section 3.7, such clandestine research is potentially regarded as being unethical and dishonest.

Though the DCT might not offer insight on authentic and spontaneous language performance, Savic argues it nevertheless reveals some degree of the respondents'

illocutionary and sociolinguistic competencies; the “[pupils’] knowledge of the linguistic forms available for the realization of these speech acts as well as their awareness of the contextual factors that need to be taken into account” (2014: 109). Kasper similarly argues that a DCT collects “intuitional data” (2008: 294), responses that might not occur during authentic discourse, but which nevertheless elicits data about what the respondents deem as suitable and appropriate speech acts for a specific purpose and social context.

Authentic discourse involves turn-taking (Kasper 2008: 282), situations where the interlocutors take turns being the speaker or the hearer. Some DCTs therefore include a rejoinder, the perlocutionary effect (Levinson 1983: 237), i.e. the form of response to the pupil’s speech act (Kasper 2008). For example, the scenario prompt is for the pupil asks for some more time to complete a test, where the rejoinder states whether the teacher accepts or refuses this request. The use of a rejoinder, and the amount of information provided in each scenario, influence the pupils’ request strategies (Kasper 2008: 293 – 294). In other words, a DCT using rejoinders might not be directly comparable to another DCT not using rejoinders.

Despite some of its drawbacks, data-collection through use of a DCT might lend itself well to examining the level of politeness in the pupils’ L2 request strategies so long as the researcher is aware of what such a tool can and cannot elicit. Furthermore, the researcher’s control of the variables and context are what made the DCT a popular data-collection method (Brubæk 2012: 7), and less time-consuming when analysing language data.

Inspired by the DCTs employed by Brubæk (2012) and Aufa (2014), the DCT for the present thesis contains six request-scenarios for the pupils to complete (in English), with variations in social distance (+/- D), relative power (+/- P) and level of imposition (+/- R) (Brown and Levinson 1987) (see Appendix B). The pupils are not informed of the requests’ imposition but must infer these from the description of social distance and relative power, drawing on their underlying illocutionary and sociolinguistic knowledge (Savic 2014).

An important note, as found by the researchers Kusevska, Ivanovska, Daskalovska and Ulanska (2016) in their investigation of pragmatic competence in a group of Macedonian EFL learners, the values of the variables D, P and R are highly subjective and difficult to determine. The pupils’ opinions of what may be considered high- or low offence situations likely differ, for example the situation involving asking for a seat on the bus. One pupil may consider it a serious face threat to ask someone to move their belongings, perhaps to the degree where the pupil chooses not to carry out the FTA, while another pupil might perhaps consider it a triviality. As stated by Kusevska et al, “[when] analysing the interlocutors’ responses, we also need to take into consideration the face threat for the speaker and the

hearer, which is not always obvious” (2016: 86). Comparing the FTAs of the present DCT to those utilized by Brubæk (2012), Aufa (2014) and Kusevska et al (2016) might therefore prove helpful when determining the face threat for the speaker and the hearer.

### **3.3 Data-collection through interviews**

Interviews were conducted to collect the qualitative data for the current thesis. “Exploratory research goals require open, inclusive, little pre-determined modes of inquiry” (Kasper and Rose 2002: 103), an argument suggesting that data-collection solely through questionnaires or other quantitative methods (e.g. the DCT employed by the current thesis) might not provide a satisfactory answer to the research questions put forward by the present study. Subjective attitudes and opinions are not easily obtained without some form of direct contact with the phenomena being investigated (Dörnyei 2007). Interviews are therefore widely used in qualitative research, and as Briggs states, “[...] 90 percent of all social science investigations use interview data” (1986: 1).

Some of the advantages of the interview-method include its flexibility, its potential for acquiring rich, detailed information, and the chance that unforeseen information might be uncovered during the oral exchange (Seliger and Shohamy 1989: 166). In other words, the researcher may ask the interviewee to elaborate on something that was said, allowing for a deeper understanding than e.g. a questionnaire might provide.

As attested by Savic (2014) and argued by Brubæk (2012), qualitative data is beneficial for further explaining quantitative findings – e.g. how attitudes towards pragmatic competence and its implementation in the classroom directly impact the results uncovered by the DCT. However, the elicited responses are shaped and in part co-constructed by the interview’s specific questions, and will not reflect stable, unchanging beliefs and attitudes towards a given subject (Kasper 2008: 296), for example a teacher’s opinions on the relevance of extensive reading compared to intensive reading.

Additionally, depending on the established rapport between the interviewer and interviewee, the latter may feel inclined to answer in a way he or she believes is correct; an answer thought to be what the interviewer wants to hear (Dörnyei 2007: 144). Another drawback of the interview-method is its time-consumption; the time spent planning, arranging, conducting, transcribing and analysing each one. Though telephone or electronic



media interviews are quicker to conduct than physical face-to-face interviews, the differences in context will shape the quality of the data (Kasper and Rose 2002: 104).

Since the present research seeks to uncover new data from a relatively small sample, a rigid and fully structured interview would potentially have left out important information. The interview guide created for the current thesis (see Appendix A) is therefore semi-structured; “[an interview] that has a set of predetermined questions, but the interviewer is free to follow up a question with additional questions that probe further” (Perry 2005: 250). As a contrast to an open interview, a complete lack of any structure or thematic overview would make obtaining relevant data difficult, with nothing to steer the conversation towards the research questions.

### **3.4 Participants**

Ten EFL teachers and 166 pupils enrolled in the programme for general studies at the age of 16-17 participated in the current study. The participants were selected from five different upper secondary schools in Rogaland. First and foremost, the participants were chosen based on their availability. In other words, the teachers and pupils are a convenience sample; a sample selected from a population easily accessible to the researcher (Perry 2005: 64). A chief drawback of a convenience sample is that the chance to reach the point of saturation, i.e. where new data no longer provides any significant new insight, is significantly reduced (Dörnyei 2007: 127).

While less than ideal, though the “[...] most common sampling strategy, at least at the postgraduate research level” (Dörnyei 2007: 129), the drawbacks of the convenience sample were attempted remedied by an additional factor: The sample was also chosen based on the assumed amount of relevant information the informants possessed, i.e. what is known as purposeful sampling (Perry 2005: 249).

Furthermore, this purposeful sampling is sub-divided into two components: The participants share a required competence and education to teach at upper secondary schools, a pre-requisite relevant to at all be part of the present study, resulting in homogeneous sampling (Dörnyei 2007: 127), participants sharing some similar qualities. Secondly, the teachers all have specific experience with teaching English at the VG1 level, following the same course curriculum, and the selection may therefore be described as typical sampling, “[...] participants whose experience is typical with regard to the research focus” (Dörnyei 2007:

128). Additionally, the selected sample resulted in part from the snowball effect; a chain reaction where those contacted recruit other participants (Dörnyei 2007: 129).

Using the teacher rosters' information available on the schools' homepages, each participant was contacted via E-mail. Those who did not have the opportunity to participate, forwarded the E-mail to his or her colleagues, which caused the snowball effect. The information included in the E-mail concerned the purpose of the interview (in brief, teacher attitudes towards pragmatic competence), the interview's estimated duration, and an assurance of the informants' anonymity by informing of the project's approval from the Norwegian Centre for Research Data (NSD). Furthermore, the E-mail also issued a request to distribute the DCT in the teacher's class.

In one of the schools, only one teacher agreed to an interview. In another, three teachers were interviewed. The three remaining schools supplied two teachers each. Two of the interviewed teachers allowed for two of their VG1 EFL classes to answer the DCT. The three remaining schools supplied one class each.

Three of the classes were solely general studies classes, and another three were general studies with sports and physical education. Lastly there was a general studies class with art, craft and design studies. Though some of the course combinations between these three specializations vary, all classes have the same amount of English teaching hours during their first VG1 year, and they follow the same course curriculum in English (LK06 2013). In other words, the involved pupils are expected to possess the same English language competence at the end of the first year of their study programme.

### **3.5 Data collection considerations and procedure**

Following a brief assertion of some of the concerns a researcher should be aware of when conducting an interview, this section covers the data collection procedure. The interview concerns address issues prior, during and after the interview. Such a brief assertion is meant to serve as a reasoning for some of the researcher's choices described in the current research project's execution in section 3.5.2.

### 3.5.1 Interview considerations

Dörnyei (2007) presents and addresses some important concerns in the three critical stages of an interview: its beginning, conduction, and conclusion. Before powering up the recorder, when creating the atmosphere of the interview (Dörnyei 2007: 139), there are certain considerations which often help improve the odds of obtaining relevant and spontaneous information. Depending on actions of the interviewer, the interviewee will either feel relaxed and comfortable, or tense and ill at ease.

For example, to loosen the interviewee's shoulders, the interviewer should provide a reminder of the interview's purpose while assuming a non-threatening and slightly informal demeanour (Seliger and Shohamy 1989: 161). Moreover, by spending a few minutes on light-hearted small-talk, the interviewee has a chance to warm up and get used to speaking with the interviewer (Dörnyei 2007: 140). If the interview is conducted in a setting which the interviewee does not frequent or is not familiar with, such small-talk is key to loosening the subject's shoulders and tongue (Dörnyei 2007).

While conducting the interview, the researcher must maintain a natural flow while at the same time aiming to acquire rich, detailed information, though without introducing their own, personal bias and assumptions (Seliger and Shohamy 1989: 166). Furthermore, the order of questions should follow the same pattern for each conducted interview. Changing the order of questions between interviews will make it difficult (if not impossible) to compare answers (Perry 2005: 119).

The researcher should also try to be aware of his or her own facial expression, body language and tone of voice – and offer feedback only when necessary (Dörnyei 2007: 142), e.g. through use of nods, simple 'yes' utterances, or other signals to indicate that the researcher is paying attention and is interested in what the subject has to say. At certain intervals, it might also prove necessary to lead the subject back on track, for example by encouraging elaboration on something that was previously said. If the interview subjects are unfamiliar with the topic, it might also prove useful to provide some form of reinforcement feedback, a kind of feedback where the interviewer indicate that he or she is pleased with the provided answers (Dörnyei 2007: 142). As Dörnyei (2007) argues, these concerns are not always easy to address, at least not for inexperienced interviewers – though awareness of such elements improve the odds of maintaining the flow of the interview.

Lastly, when concluding the interview, the researcher should allow the interview subject to comment on what has been said, or to elaborate or change previous statements

(Dörnyei 2007). Furthermore, the participant should also be informed of some way to reach the researcher if s/he later has comments, questions or for other reasons needs to get in touch due to concerns regarding his or her participation. The interviewee should also be sincerely thanked for participating.

### 3.5.2 Data collection procedure

The interviews were conducted at the teachers' work places, either inside a conference room or a group study room (whichever was available and vacant on site), settings the interview subjects were familiar with. A smart-phone was used for voice-recording, a device with a recorder in both the head and rear end, which assisted with better simultaneous capture of the voices of the interviewer and interviewee.

Before the starting the interviews, the participants were reminded of their anonymity, of why the interview would be recorded, and of the interview's estimated duration. They were also reminded of how the collected data would be used and potentially presented. The teachers consented to being recorded, and all except one of the them agreed to conduct the interview in English. While establishing the atmosphere, the first five minutes were first spent on small-talk (before the recorder was turned on).

The interviewed teachers for the present study stated prior to and during the interviews that they were unfamiliar with the topic at hand. Reinforcement feedback therefore proved necessary. Occasional confirmations, smiles and nods seemed to help make the teachers more confident of themselves and their answers. The final question of the interview guide gave the respondents a chance to offer some of their final thoughts or opinions. Each interview subject was thanked for participating, and a few minutes were spent on additional, friendly small-talk before leaving.

Distribution and overseeing of the DCTs was done through personal attendance for better control of the procedure and the adherence to a repeated pattern for data collection (Dörnyei 2007). Regardless of whether some of the classes had been alerted of the visit from a researcher beforehand by their teachers, about ten minutes were spent on briefly stating the visit's general purpose, i.e. the distribution of a DCT and how to answer it. With the pupils' consent, the instructions and information were given in English. The pupils were asked to write actual language realisations, i.e. exactly what they would say in each situation, word for word. They were also informed of their anonymity and that no answers would be traceable to any single individual.

Furthermore, one point was explicitly stressed – the option to refuse to participate. The pupils were told that participation was strictly voluntary and would not be graded, nor affect their standing with their teacher or school in any way whether they participate or not. Additionally, they did not have to give a reason for choosing not to participate. Only one of the one-hundred-and-sixty-six visited pupils refused to participate.

Afterwards, they were offered the opportunity to ask questions about the test's format, though no information was given about the concrete purpose of the DCT. Everyone could ask for help while answering the DCT, if there were certain words or scenarios difficult to understand. Lastly, two points were repeated and stressed in Norwegian: that they were expected to write explicit responses to each prompt, and that they could back out at any moment.

Each class spent roughly ten to fifteen minutes completing the DCT. After personally collecting the pupils' answers, they were asked about what they thought the DCT measured. Though reluctant to answer at first, the general assumptions in each class was that "it had something to do with asking for things", "politeness," or "how boys and girls ask in different ways".

They were then explicitly informed of what the DCT measured and how the data would be used in a thesis. The explanation resulted in five spontaneous instances of very brief, though engaging and informal back-and-forth discussions about politeness in Norwegian language in comparison to the English language with the pupils. To show appreciation for their participation, a couple of minutes were also spent on sincerely thanking them for their help and time, and on light-hearted small-talk.

### **3.6 Data analysis tools**

The written DCT data was categorised and analysed using the Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP) coding manual (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989). The CCSARP was constructed based on the elicited responses from two DCTs examining the realization of two different speech acts: requests and apologies. The CCSARP is an extensive data analysis tool, and since the DCT used for the present study only examines requests, the present chapter ignores the coding manual's categorization of apology strategies. More detailed descriptions of the different, relevant request categories are covered in chapter 4.

In the instance of requests, the elicited response is by the coding manual broken down into an alerter, a head act, adjuncts to the head acts (or: supportive moves), and the request's perspective. An alerter is how the speaker gains the hearer's attention through, for example, calling the other person's name, or by using a pronoun, title, endearment term (e.g. honey), or any combinations of these (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989: 276). The head act is the "[...] minimal unit which can realize a request; it is the core of the request sequence" (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989: 265), for example "give me that pen".

The head act may be internally modified through use of e.g. the politeness marker 'please', past tense forms or negation, hedging, or combinations of these, for instance "you couldn't hand me that pen, please?" This head act may also be externally modified by the adjuncts. These adjuncts occur either before or after the modified head act, and these modifiers include e.g. a preparator, grounder, disarmer, or for example insults and/or threats (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989: 287-288).

The preparator typically involves asking for permission to make a request. The grounder is used when giving a reason for making the request, and the disarmer serves to limit the risk of having the request rejected. An example may serve to demonstrate a combination of an alerter, a modified head act of 'give me a ride' and three supportive moves: a preparator, disarmer and grounder (though see Blum-Kulka et al (1989) or Savic (2014) for additional categories):

*"Tom, I would like to ask you for a favour, though I know you don't enjoy driving. You couldn't possibly give me a ride into town on Sunday? I have a doctor's appointment."*

'Tom' functions in this example as the alerter. A preparator then follows, 'I would like to ask you for a favour', before the disarmer 'though I know you don't enjoy driving'. The head act has been internally modified through use of past tense and negation, in addition to using the downtoner 'possibly'. Finally, the speaker uses a grounder, 'I have a doctor's appointment'.

The request perspective of the speech act changes depending on who realizes the request, e.g. the speaker (can *I* borrow that?), hearer (could *you* give me that?), both (could *we* leave?), or whether impersonal pronouns are used to avoid targeting either the speaker or the hearer (can *one* get some help?) (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989: 278). Brown and Levinson's (1987) FTA theory is applied to examine the directness of the request strategy, the

“[...] degree to which the speaker’s illocutionary intent is apparent from the locution” (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989: 278).

The FTA strategies are either on- or off record. If done on record, it is realised with or without redressive action (counteracting any damage to the addressee’s positive or negative face) (Brown and Levinson 1987: 69). An example of an FTA done on record without redressive action (baldly), e.g. “get out of my way” is significantly more direct than an FTA done off record through use of a hint, e.g. “it is a little cold in here” (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989: 280).

As these examples demonstrate, quantitative data analysis methods are “well defined and differentiated” (Seliger and Shohamy 1989: 201). The collected data fits into established categories and may be further converted into numerical forms and statistical tables depending on the number of counted occurrences of e.g. on record FTAs with externally or internally modified head acts.

Qualitative data, on the other hand, often contain long sequences of recorded written or oral texts, e.g. interviews, with significant variations in the collected material (e.g. attitudes and opinions). Though there may be patterns and shared similarities between the recordings, the “[...] categories emerge from the data themselves rather than a specific analysis being imposed on the data” (Seliger and Shohamy 1989: 205). Rather than using pre-determined categories of analysis, such categories are inductive (Seliger and Shohamy 1989: 205); the collected data forms the basis of analysis used on the remainder of the data. As such, qualitative data analysis might be described as a recurring process until the analysis represents what the researcher interprets as the “essential features” (Seliger and Shohamy 1989: 211) of the material.

The gathered interview material was first transcribed, then analysed question-by-question for similarities, i.e. a pattern, and differences between the participants’ answers. 166 answered DCTs resulted in 996 requests, or FTAs, for analysis. The head act was identified, then analysed for internal and external modification, i.e. the number of times combinations of negation and/or past tense was used, and the most commonly recurring adjuncts. Furthermore, the requests were analysed to establish what type of interrogative they were, i.e. whether the requests were off record hints, or indirect requests referring to ability, permission, possibility or willingness.

Requests referring to ability take the modal verb ‘can’, e.g. ‘can you give me the book?’ Permission requests take the modal verb ‘may’, as in ‘may I borrow a book?’.

Requests referring to possibility are often impersonal, e.g. ‘is it possible to borrow a book?’ a

type of request that questions the feasibility of a request rather than realising the request (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989: 280). Willingness requests are demonstrated by the modal verb 'will', e.g. 'will you lend me a book?'. Hints do not immediately reveal the illocutionary intent, however they contain elements of the intended illocution, for example 'I forgot my book today.' Additionally, the FTAs were categorized by their degree of directness, i.e. whether they were on or off record according to Brown and Levinson's (1987) FTA theory.

### **3.7 Research validity, reliability, and ethical considerations**

Validity "[...] refers to the extent to which the data collection procedure measures what it intends to measure" (Seliger and Shohamy 1989: 188). For example, research using a method for examining reading proficiency in a group of English native speakers might not be considered valid when applied on a group of non-native English speakers. Though difficult to prove, there should at least exist some evidence of validity in a given research project (Seliger and Shohamy 1989).

According to Dörnyei (2007), there are several ways to examine validity, and the measurement of research validity differs between quantitative and qualitative research. For quantitative research, the chief threats to validity "[...] concern unintended factors, circumstances, flaws or events that can invalidate the results (Dörnyei 2007: 53), for instance the *Hawthorne effect* (Dörnyei 2007: 53), how participants produce different results than they normally would when they know they are being studied. For qualitative research, threats to validity generally concern researcher bias and wrongful interpretations. These threats can be reduced if the researcher presents the data collection process in detail, while demonstrating an awareness of how the researcher might be biased in certain ways, or how the data could be alternatively interpreted (Dörnyei 2007: 60).

Reliability in quantitative research refers to the degree the applied method (the instruments and procedures) produce consistent results "[...] in a given population in different circumstances" (Dörnyei 2007: 50). Reliability concerns the test scores, not the tests themselves, and if there are great discrepancies in test scores because of e.g. a change in how a DCT is administered, the results are unreliable. An adherence to procedure and pattern of distribution is therefore key in quantitative research.



Similarly, reliable qualitative data are obtained if the applied method is repeated and acquires the same results (Dörnyei 2007: 57), however because of how e.g. interviews gather subjective information, this type of reliability might be difficult to achieve. As argued by Savic (2014: 101), the use of method triangulation reduces the threat to validity and reliability; combining qualitative and quantitative methods potentially lessens researcher or instrument bias.

Drawing on Savic (2014), Kasper (2008), Dörnyei's (2007), and Seliger and Shohamy's (1989) arguments, transparency in use of instruments and interpretations appears to be the major issue. Though no research is flawless, and no sample is perfect, the researcher should aim to be as clear, honest and coherent about the applied methods, their implementations, flaws, and limitations. In the case of interviews, including transcripts of recordings (see Appendix C) allows the readers to draw their own assumptions and to challenge or verify the researcher's interpretations (Seliger and Shohamy 1989: 205).

To make the quantitative data, the DCTs, reliable and valid, the pupils were all given the same amount of information before beginning to write their answers. They also had the same amount of time to complete their answers, and all of them could ask for help. For each occasion of data collection, the DCT distribution and collection was personally overseen by the researcher. In an attempt to reduce the Hawthorne effect, nothing was stated about the intents and purpose of the study prior to collecting the pupils' answers. In other words, even though the pupils were aware that they were being examined, they did not know precisely what type of answer the researcher was looking for.

Adhering to a pattern of data collection was more challenging during the interviews. The teachers stated prior to the interviews that they were unfamiliar with pragmatics and the term pragmatic competence. Therefore, to keep the interview focused on the topic for study, it seemed necessary to provide a quick and strictly limited example of a definition of pragmatic competence either before or during the interviews. The phrasings of the explanation were however different between each interview, which might have impacted the teachers' answers in some way.

A lack of explanation would potentially have left the teachers guessing for answers, while making them unsure and uncomfortable because of the unfamiliarity with the topic (Dörnyei 2007). On the other hand, interviews conducted without such a brief explanation would have yielded different answers. Ideally, every interview should have followed the exact same pattern when offering a brief explanation.

Random sampling of pupils from different upper secondary schools would have strengthened the representativity of the DCT data. However, the involved sample is relatively large, and demonstrates tendencies in the VG1 programme for general studies pupils' pragmatic linguistic competence in English. Similarly, random sampling of teachers would have yielded more representative data of attitudes towards pragmatic competence and its relevance.

Moreover, attitudes and opinions are frequently changing (Kasper 2008). As opposed to the present research, a longitudinal analysis could have provided better evidence of stable beliefs. Interview data found in the present study is open to alternative interpretations; other researchers might object to certain claims that are based on the collected data. For better transparency, transcriptions of each interview are therefore included (see Appendix C).

In addition to reliability and validity, there are several ethical considerations to consider when carrying out the research. As stated by Dörnyei (2007), research conducted in a classroom environment is generally disruptive. Classroom practitioners must modify and adapt their timetable and lesson plans to accommodate for a researcher's visit. In other words, there are certain precautions the researcher must have in mind before conducting any experiment(s) involving human subjects. These precautions are briefly summarized in a deceptively simple statement: "[...] you are expected to be nice and interfere as little as possible in your subjects' lives" (Rounds 1996: 53), something that might be achieved at least to some degree by following three basic ethical principles for classroom research drawn from arguments by e.g. Dörnyei (2003 and 2007), Seliger and Shohamy (1989), and Rounds (1996).

Chief among these three principles, is the concern that no mental or physical harm of any kind should befall the participants (Dörnyei 2003: 91). Though the teachers and interviews unlikely run the risk of physical injury through their participation, there are other ways by which they could be harmed. For example, the involved pupils' may not benefit from the research project, and there is the potential risk that the project disrupts and/or harms the pupils' learning process since it borrows time which might have been better spent on teaching (Dörnyei 2007: 190).

Secondly, the question of respondent confidentiality and privacy must be carefully considered and constantly attended. The collected data, if made public (though only with the participants' consent), should be coded to remove identifying information (Seliger and Shohamy 1989), e.g. by presenting findings through numerical group statistics and tables, or, in the case of interviews, through unnamed transcripts.

It is the researcher's obligation to maintain the agreed upon confidentiality, and the participants should have been provided with enough information to be able to "[...] give their informed consent concerning participation and the use of data" (Dörnyei 2003: 92).

Moreover, the NSD explains that any research projects involving pupils above the age of fifteen requires a clarification with the institutional management (Norwegian Centre for Research Data 2017) at each involved school.

In addition to considerations concerning harm and respondent confidentiality, Dörnyei addresses the final important principle: respondents should not feel any overdue pressure to participate in the project, and they reserve the right to withdraw from participation without an explanation or fear of repercussions (2003: 92). The researcher should make it sufficiently clear that participation is voluntary, especially when pupils are involved.

To adhere to the first principle of avoiding harm, the interviews were kept relatively short so that the teachers were not impeded by the project. Distributing and collecting DCTs was done quickly. The teachers got to decide on a most suitable day for the interview and/or the DCT distribution. To adhere to the second principle, all participants were repeatedly informed and assured of their anonymity. Any interview transcriptions in chapter 4 of the current thesis have been modified to ensure the participants' anonymity. However, these adjustments are minor, i.e. only altering names of other people, work places, or other information that is sensitive, though not relevant to the current study. Finally, all participants were repeatedly told that participation was voluntary, and everyone was free to withdraw at any point, without giving a reason.

## 4 Results

This chapter presents the results from the teacher interviews and DCTs outlined in chapter 3. Section 4.1 covers the ten teacher interviews through a question-by-question overlook of the central reflections and opinions, i.e. the essential features (Seliger and Shohamy 1989) combined with short transcripts. Section 4.2 presents the analysis of the distributed DCTs through tables and verbal descriptions.

### 4.1 Interview results

Ten teacher interviews were conducted at five different upper secondary schools in Rogaland. The questions are presented in a chronological order, the same way they were asked during the interviews. Analysis of the interviews discovered that the participants' answers were relatively similar. To avoid unnecessary repetition, section 4.1.1 offers a thematic overview, instead of presenting each interview individually. The ten interview subjects are presented as teacher 1 (T1), teacher 2 (T2), teacher 3 (T3), and so forth. T1, T2 and T3 work in school 1 (S1). T4 works in school 2 (S2). T5 and T6 work in school 3 (S3). T7 and T8 work in school 4 (S4). T9 and T10 work in school 5 (S5).

Some edits are made in the presented transcriptions below, signalled by use of square brackets, e.g. [example]. These edits are made to improve coherency, or to ensure the interviewee's anonymity. Due to concerns regarding the interviewed teachers' schedule, i.e. what is most convenient for the interviewee, three of the interviews (T7, T9 and T10) were conducted after having distributed a DCT in the teacher's class.

#### 4.1.1 Question one: immediate thoughts on pragmatic competence

The first question of the conducted interviews was: what are your immediate thoughts when you hear the term pragmatic competence? Every teacher had before this question, prior to turning on the recorder, expressed that they were unfamiliar with pragmatics and pragmatic competence. For example, T5 stated, '[...] honestly, I'm not even one hundred percent sure I know exactly what it is [...]'. T9 admitted, '[...] I don't know the exact definition [...]'. Similarly, T10 said that pragmatic competence '[...] is not a word that [I am too] familiar with'.

While hesitant to answer the first question, a consensus of their immediate thoughts was that pragmatic competence has something to do with one of the following: A) being practical, i.e. seeking solutions and being pragmatic in the everyday sense of the word, or B) everyday use of language. For example, T6 said that pragmatic competence is more than just use of language in the classroom. It is about how people communicate in real life, in real life situations. T2's immediate concern was how pragmatic competence is meant to fit during a lesson. T2 said each lesson was planned based on the curriculum, '[...] because it's our primary document [...] that we are subjected to [...]'. T1, who related pragmatic competence to being practical, saw being practical as a very important competency, and suggested that pragmatic competence should be part of the curriculum.

T8 commented that pragmatic use of language is about getting around an issue in one way or another. For example, when a pupil is at a loss for words, s/he seeks alternative solutions to best solve the problem on the spot. T8 also suggested it involves a person's willingness to talk in every situation, even when the person is not certain of the correct words or phrases to use in the given context. T4 saw pragmatic competence as being aware of certain phrases and words in a target language to achieve some specific purpose. In addition to giving a few examples of specific purposes such as 'can you open the window' and 'could you pass me that' T4 said:

At the university, when we spoke German and we read books, and we talked about history and stuff, that I didn't know how to say, where is the spatula, you know, or the easier things that you say around the kitchen table for example. [...] [S]o, I think pragmatic English is more [about] little things that you need to say.

T7 suggested pragmatic competence involves knowing of a country's social codes, e.g. correct everyday use of language when visiting another country as a tourist. T7 mentioned having watched a programme with the pupils in class about a Norwegian visiting Scotland, and that the Norwegian was exposed as a foreigner since he behaved in an uncustomary way. T7 mentioned one of those codes, the word 'please', and hoped during the interview that the pupils had remembered to write please in their DCT answers.

Only one of the teachers, T10, stated in the first question that pragmatic competence was paid attention to in class, if not explicitly; '[...] I was kind of happy to realise that this is actually something that I do without knowing it, in many ways, that I'm very concerned about in my teaching.' T10 realised pragmatic competence was addressed, to some extent, after

having read through the questions in the previously distributed DCT. Regardless, the teachers did not immediately present a concrete definition of pragmatic competence, and their answers were, as they admitted, primarily assumptions and guesses.

#### 4.1.2 Question two: relevance of pragmatic competence

The second question was: what is your view on the relevance of pragmatic competence in English for Norwegian pupils? After having established some idea of what pragmatic competence is, the teachers appeared more confident in their answers, e.g. T1 immediately went on to say that pragmatic competence is relevant. T1, a teacher born and raised in another English-speaking country, could give Norwegian pupils a different perspective on what is appropriate or polite. Every country has its own unique culture, T1 said, and added:

[...] you need to address people in a way that they're accepted, especially if you're wanting to get something out of it. These students are gonna be going on to university, they're gonna need to appease teachers, and colleagues in the future, and secure a job. And so, if they don't approach the situation in a proper method, then of course they are gonna be screwed.

T1 further went on to say that even if the young pupils are influenced by and learn certain phrases from American mass media and computer games, they still need to expand their vocabulary to be able to consciously adapt to the needs of other situations. This need for vocabulary growth echoes T4's sentiment about the importance of teaching pupils the words for how to say the little, but purposeful things in a language.

T2 and T3 talked about the relevance of pragmatic competence in connection to use of formal language. T3 mentioned that it is important that Norwegian EFL pupils are aware of not just practical use of language, e.g. ordering food, but also the conventions on how to write an academic text in any target language. Moreover, T3 wanted Norwegian EFL pupils to be aware of that there the different conventions for appropriate language use when giving an oral presentation as opposed to when writing an essay.

T2 returned to the curriculum, pointing to one of the competence aims which states that the pupils are expected to adapt their texts and communication to the current situation. T2 additionally stated that this curriculum aim is given particular focus through teaching of formal versus informal aspects of language in S1. This statement was supported by T1 and

T3. T1 stated for example that they talked about how, for instance, language use in social media is different from writing an article or an informal blog. T1 warned the pupils that if they did not know how to adapt their language to the needs of the current situation, they risked making fools of themselves. T2, also born and raised in another country, found Norwegian pupils to be less formal than T2 thought ideal. T6 shared T2's opinion, arguing that:

[...] they tend to be really informal, I mean in Norwegian we know they use more of a dialect than the written form of language, and in English they don't really understand the difference between formal and informal, and don't understand the purpose of [...] why we need to be formal sometimes, and sometimes it's ok to be informal.

T6 suggested that one of the reasons behind Norwegian pupils' inability to differentiate between formal and informal writing is because creative writing disappeared from the curriculum. According to T6, one of the chief purposes of creative writing is that the pupil needs to imagine s/he is writing for a self-chosen audience.

T10 saw pragmatic competence as very relevant. T10 argued that having knowledge of other cultural norms is essential to be a part of any culture, and a lack of knowledge can lead to an individual's exclusion from a particular culture. A lack of knowledge of correct phrases and conventions can also, according to T10, lead to uncomfortable situations. T9 knew that pupils will need English when leaving school, since English will be encountered either in a future work place, or during travel abroad. T9 therefore believed it to be relevant for Norwegian EFL pupils to be taught everyday use of the English language.

T8 admitted to not having spent much time thinking about the relevance of pragmatic competence, but reflected around how Norwegian pupils risked offending e.g. British people. Like T1, T8 argued that American mass media influenced Norwegian pupils, and without awareness of correct terms of address or correct behaviour, they risk ending up in awkward situations in England, for example when encountering a Brit with a '[...] stiff upper lip'. Rather than formal and informal varieties of writing and speaking, T7, T8, T9 and T10 appeared more focused on the relevance of politeness issues in everyday encounters abroad.

T5 argued that pragmatic competence is important and relevant for Norwegian pupils, however T5 imagined that there are better ways to acquire this competence than inside the classroom. Additionally, T5 stated that the relevance '[...] depends, because there are different classes. Some are vocational studies, and most likely they won't use that much

English in their work.’ T5 therefore saw pragmatic competence as primarily relevant for pupils in the programme for general studies.

#### 4.1.3 Question three: current focus on teaching pragmatic competence

Question three was, what do you think of the current focus on teaching pragmatic competence? T4 believed there to be a lack of focus in lower secondary school. Moreover, T4 stated that several pupils reported that they rarely ever spoke English in lower secondary school. Furthermore, T4’s pupils claimed that in some cases, not even their previous teachers spoke English, which T4 argued might have impeded their development of pragmatic competence. T4 said that the pupils were not allowed to speak Norwegian during English lessons in S2, and pragmatic competence was therefore given at least an implicit, but not explicit focus.

The suggestion that pragmatic competence is given implicit focus was supported by e.g. T5 and T6. For example, T5 argued that pragmatic competence is given some focus when pupils learn of different cultures in English and other subjects. When teachers try to show the difference between formal and informal language, T5 claimed it is also given some attention. However, T5 suggested that a reason for the lack of explicit focus is due to how difficult it is to replicate real-life situations inside a classroom. T6 believed that, though it depends on the teacher, pragmatic competence has a very small role in Norwegian EFL classrooms. As T6 claimed, ‘[...] overall most teachers don’t pay much attention it, and they’re not aware of it [...]’. Similarly, T1 stated simply, ‘I wouldn’t have ever thought there was a focus.’

T7 and T8 were also of the impression that pragmatic competence receives little attention in the classroom, i.e. that its development is rarely or ever planned. Though pupils are shown films in school with focus on different contexts and cultures, the pupils are not explicitly told to behave or converse like the people and cultures shown in the film. T8 stated the lack of focus and planning might be due to a lack of time, i.e. lessons are short and other competencies are more important. The lack of planned development of pragmatic competence was also suggested by T9 who said:

[...] me and my colleague, we plan all classes together. We always say, they have to read, write, listen and speak, through for instance two times forty-five minutes. They have to do all this. But we never discuss the pragmatic use of English. That’s not a



term we use when we plan. We might discuss competence aims and formal, informal language, but not pragmatics, no.

While T1 believed there is a complete lack of focus, T1's colleagues, T2 and T3 believed there exists a certain focus on developing pragmatic competence. For instance, T3 suggested that if knowledge of formal and informal aspects of language are part of pragmatic competence, then development of pragmatic competence is given focus. However, T3 admitted that aside from formal and informal aspects, pragmatic competence does not receive much more treatment in Norwegian EFL classrooms. T2 argued that, while pragmatic competence is not a primary focus, it is definitely present in Norwegian EFL classrooms:

I mean, just have a look at the curriculum, you will see that many of the competence aims are actually, the awareness of the student of adjusting their ways of communication to the specific situation, and I mean, in order to do that, they have to know how to use the language, so we have to teach them that.

T10 also argued there is a focus on pragmatic competence. However, T10 believed that the elements, for instance politeness issues, that are taught explicitly may not correspond with what the pupils experience in real life situations. While there are certain things, e.g. phrases, pupils need to be aware of, T10 argued the pupils can mostly be themselves when visiting England. However, an echo of T5's argument was shared by T10 who believed that authentic situations are best served to develop a pupil's pragmatic competence. As T10 stated, '[...] you don't really get to experience what it's like before you actually go there [...]']'.

#### 4.1.4 Question four: how pragmatic competence is taught

Question four was, how do you teach your pupils how to be pragmatically competent in the English language? By reflecting around the second and third question, some of the teachers had already begun answering this fourth question. For example, some teachers had the impression pragmatic competence is developed implicitly in Norwegian EFL classrooms. On the other hand, T10 stated that the pupils are explicitly taught and made aware of politeness issues in class.

T10 stated that the pupils' pragmatic competence is developed through anecdotal accounts of T10's personal experiences with English people. T10 tells the pupils of certain

ways to behave, and what is polite to say or not to say in specific situations, e.g. types of address. T10 has also attempted roleplaying, however the pupils were embarrassed when they had to speak English to another Norwegian. Roleplay is also carried out in T9's English lessons. T9 said:

We also [...] make roleplay of very informal situations where they're supposed to use slang and casual language. [...] It's difficult, because [...] situations in the classroom [...] are not real-life situations, but you want them to use as much English as possible. So, you have to make up situations, but they work.

In addition to the roleplay of informal situations, some of T9's roleplay scenarios involved more formal situations, such as applying for a job and carrying out job interviews. Additionally, T9 stated that the pupils are made aware of how certain changes to a written text could have made it more academic, polite and professional. However, teaching politeness was according to T9 not given explicit focus. T6 did however pay attention to politeness issues, stating that '[...] we talk about politeness with the UK for instance, and the US, and similarities and differences [...] compared to Norwegian, you know, sitting next to someone on the bus'.

T7 stated that the pupils' pragmatic competence is developed when they watch films and read literature, though not explicitly. T7 suggested that certain texts and books can be used to explicitly focus on developing the pupils' pragmatic competence through an awareness of social codes. However, T7 did not give any examples of such books or texts. Like e.g. T9, T10 and T5, T7 saw the relevance of taking the pupils abroad, so that they may experience the culture, stating that some Norwegian EFL classes do get to travel, though not all.

T4 and T1 appeared to agree that forcing the pupils to use English instead of Norwegian likely results in a better developed pragmatic competence. T1 said that making pupils more used to speaking English in front of others will make them better prepared to deal with real life contexts. It will also make them more confident language users, which T1 hoped would inspire the pupils to continue using the language:

[...] it's use it or lose it. Just because you've had [English] for ten years doesn't mean if you stop taking it for two years that you're gonna be equipped to do the English that you're gonna have to do at the university. And the books are becoming more and

more English [...] and, so you're gonna have to be aware and able to attack those situations.

T1 mentioned how Norwegian pupils read American magazines, but those magazines have sarcasm irony and other aspects of American language that Norwegians will not understand, and teachers should therefore, '[...] give [the pupils] the tools to learn to decipher this information'. T2, T3, T5 and T8 stated that their pupils' pragmatic competence is developed through lessons on the distinction between formal and informal language, e.g. writing a blog compared to an article or an essay. At this point during the interview, T2 claimed that pragmatic competence is actively taught, that they have had sessions explicitly focusing on the informal and formal distinction. T2 did not comment on politeness issues.

T5 believed that pupils develop their pragmatic competence during lessons where T5 presents different cultures, in addition to lessons on formal and informal use of language. T8, in addition to focusing on formal and informal use of language, focused on vocabulary variation and precision. Politeness issues were less of a concern, '[...] we don't talk a lot about please and those kinds of things. That's sort of not our cup of tea'.

#### 4.1.5 Question five: rough estimate of time spent teaching pragmatic competence

Question five was, do you have a rough estimate on how much time you spend per week, month or year on teaching pragmatic competence? Since the general assumption was that development of pragmatic competence was carried out implicitly, the teachers struggled with answering question five. As T6 said, even if politeness issues are sometimes addressed, '[...] it's barely nothing'.

Even though T5 saw developing pragmatic competence as part of everyday lessons, T5 could not give a specific or rough estimate on the time spent. Similar answers were given by T2, T3, T4, T7 and T8, who could not present any rough estimate. However, a consensus among the teachers was that pragmatic competence was to some degree present, as a happy accident rather than the result of concrete planning. T10 claimed that pragmatic competence is developed every day in T10's lessons, since T10 focuses on giving polite instructions and, e.g. the pupils are prompted to give advice on how to correct or improve other pupils' texts. T1 guessed that twenty-five percent of the lessons focus on pragmatic competence.

#### 4.1.6 Question six: final or concluding thoughts

Question six was, what are your final or concluding thoughts? T10 said that by focusing on different politeness issues and presenting personal anecdotes, the pupils have been made aware of cultural differences. T10 hoped such awareness makes Norwegian EFL pupils think about that different cultures require types of behaviour different from what they are used to. Lastly, T10 believed that the interview and reflection around the presented questions were a helpful step to becoming better teachers, and that more teachers should reflect on their own teaching practices. T7 was excited to learn what the current study might discover.

T2 questioned whether pragmatic competence should be given unique emphasis to help make pupils competent language users; '[...] language is like water [...] it's never the same [...]'. As language changes, T2 claimed that how pragmatic competence and other language competencies are taught need to change, and it may therefore be difficult or meaningless to emphasise one specific way to teach pragmatic competence in the course curriculum.

T4's final sentiment was that pragmatic competence should be taught more explicitly, and similar to what T1 suggested, teachers should reflect on it more. Additionally, T4 stated that pragmatics and purposeful use of language in everyday situations should be discussed with the pupils. E.g. teachers should explain the reasons why people behave and say certain things differently in other contexts.

T3 admitted to a lack of reflection on and knowledge of pragmatic competence prior to the interview, though was made more consciously aware of how to implement elements of pragmatics when going on a study trip abroad, such as reminding the pupils of saying please. T9 suggested that developing pragmatic competence can be given more focus by incorporating it into existing language teaching methods carried out while working on different topics.

T8 concluded that lower secondary schools should deal with pragmatic competence to a greater extent, since VG1 is the final year where English is an obligatory course for Norwegian EFL pupils in the programme for general studies. T5 said that it is difficult to create natural language environments in which pragmatic competence can be developed, especially due to time constraints. T6 concluded that pragmatic competence can be given focus in more than just the English subject. One of the reasons T6 was that other subjects deal with informing pupils of other cultures, and how to approach other cultures. While T6 does not want the pupils to become British, T6 stated that, '[...] we need to make our students

better prepared for real life stations as well. [...] Starting in a new company, how to behave [...] what to do, not to do, what to say, not to [say], different circumstances, different situations, and we don't really do that.'

## 4.2 DCT results

Six DCT scenarios were distributed among a total of 166 pupils from seven different VGI EFL classrooms, resulting in 996 DCT items for analysis. Presenting the individual discoveries from each of the seven classes would require too much of the current study's space. The request scenarios therefore demonstrate the combined amount of the most frequently recurring speech act strategies elicited by the pupils.

### 4.2.1 Scenario 1: Asking to borrow a textbook from the teacher

Scenario 1 introduces a situation where a pupil, *S*, has forgotten his or her textbook, and needs to borrow one from their teacher, *H*. The teacher's authority places *H* above the *S* in terms of relative power (P) (Brown and Levinson 1987). While not stated explicitly, there is perhaps a greater social distance (D) between a pupil and a teacher, than between two pupils who are friends. Lastly, the request might prove to be a hinderance to the teacher's unimpeded teaching, if it is the teacher's only textbook. However, borrowing a book is considered free goods, "things and services [...] which all members of the public may reasonably demand from one another" (Brown and Levinson 1987: 80), thereby lowering the imposition (R). Two of the pupils misunderstood the task. Their answers are not included in the table or description below.

Type of interrogative	Ability	Permission	Other
Distribution	111 (68 %)	31 (19 %)	22 (13 %)
Formulations	Can I borrow a book (...) / do you have a book I can borrow (...)	May I borrow your book (...)	Is it possible that I could borrow (...)/ I was wondering if I could borrow

**Table 1:** Request strategies when asking to borrow a textbook from the teacher

As Table 1 demonstrates, the most common request strategy referred to ability, taking the modal verb ‘can’. 158 requests were speaker-oriented, i.e. whether *S* could borrow a textbook from *H*. Five were hearer-oriented, i.e. whether *H* could give *S* a textbook. The final two were impersonal, referring to neither of the interlocutors. The ability requests accounted for 111 of all requests.

The second most chosen strategy referred to permission, taking the modal ‘may’. 31 pupils asked e.g. ‘may I borrow your textbook’. Among the 22 least common request strategies were formulations referring to possibility or using a past progressive and/or past tense such as ‘I was wondering if I could’, ‘is it possible that I could’ and ‘I forgot my textbook...’. Only three of the 22 least common request strategies were bald/direct requests, e.g. ‘give me a textbook’.

31 of the pupils used a past tense, e.g. ‘could I borrow’ instead of the present tense ‘can I borrow’. The downtoner ‘maybe’ was counted three times, e.g. ‘could I maybe borrow your book?’. Downtoners modify requests internally. They are “[...] sentential or propositional modifiers [...] used by a speaker in order to modulate the impact [of the request on the hearer]” (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989: 284). Three hedges were also found: ‘by any chance’ and ‘perhaps’. Hedges are internal, adverbial modifiers that are used when *S* “[...] wishes to avoid a precise propositional specification in order to avoid the potential provocation of such precision” (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989: 284). One pupil used negation, ‘you mightn’t have a spare?’. The three downtoners, hedges and one instance of negation were the only type of internal modification aside from past tense and the 22 formulations in the ‘other’ category of table 1.

External modification was more frequent. Alerters were employed 48 times to catch *H*’s attention, e.g. ‘excuse me’ and ‘teacher’. 104 grounders were counted, external modifiers which serve as reasons or justifications for the request (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989: 287), e.g. ‘I forgot my textbook at home’. 26 pupils used the politeness marker ‘please’ to mitigate their requests. There were only a few spelling and grammatical errors, and these were insignificant in terms of realising correct and coherent requests. The most common mistake was the lower case ‘i’ instead of upper case. The second most common mistake concerned the spelling of the word ‘excuse’ in ‘excuse me’.

#### 4.2.2 Scenario 2: Asking a stranger for directions

In Scenario 2, the pupil has gotten lost while on a trip to London. The pupil needs to ask a stranger for directions. In other words, (D) is relatively great. The Scenario does not state where the interlocutors stand in terms of (P). (R) is not considered too great since a request for directions is counted among Brown and Levinson's (1987) free goods. Two of the pupils misunderstood the task. Their answers are not included in the table or description below.

Type of interrogative	Ability	Hint	Willingness	Other
Distribution	59 (36 %)	94 (57 %)	5 (3 %)	6 (4 %)
Formulations	Can you tell me the way (...)/ can you help me	Do you know the way to (...)/ do you have the directions to (...)	Would you help me (...)	I was wondering if you could (...)

**Table 2:** *Request strategies when asking a stranger for directions*

As shown in Table 2, 94 of requests in Scenario 2 were off record hints (Brown and Levinson 1987: 69), e.g. 'do you know the way to my hotel?'. Hints are a type of query that requires more inferencing from *H* since the illocutionary intent is not immediately clear (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989). Such hints often prepare *H* for the next question, 'can/could you tell me?', however such a follow-up question is not uttered if *H* understands what *S* infers using the hint.

The second most common request strategy referred to ability. 59 pupils questioned whether *H* had the ability to help *S* find their way back to the hotel. Five of the pupils referred to *H*'s willingness to help, taking the past tense of the modal 'will', e.g. 'would you help me'. One of the final six requests was a bald/direct request, 'help me'. The five remaining requests were formulations such as 'I was wondering if you could help me'. All except two of the requests were hearer-oriented. 28 pupils used a past tense, e.g. 'could you help me'. One instance of negation was counted among the answers. Two downtoners, 'maybe', were counted. Four hedges were also found, e.g. 'perhaps' and 'try to'.

Similar to Scenario 1, Scenario 2 produced a frequent use of external modification. 144 alerters were counted, the most common of them being 'excuse me'. 18 pupils prepared *H*

for a question with a preparator, an external modifier where *S* is first “[...] asking about the potential availability of the hearer for carrying out the request” (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989: 287), e.g. ‘do you know this area?’ and ‘are you familiar here?’. 20 pupils used the politeness marker ‘please’. 53 grounders were employed to give a reason for the request, e.g. ‘I am lost’. The spelling and grammar mistakes were equal to those found in Scenario 1.

#### 4.2.3 Scenario 3: Asking a friend for a loan

Scenario 3 differs from Scenario 1 and 2 due to *S*’s greater imposition on *H*. *S* wants to see a new movie at the cinema, but *S* does not have enough money for a movie ticket. *S* is prompted to ask *H*, a friend, for a loan. Since they are friends, (D) is low between *S* and *H*. They may also be seen as equals in terms of (P), given that they are both pupils of the same age in school. (R) is greater than in Scenario 1 and 2. Borrowing money is not asking for free goods and puts a greater strain on *H*’s negative face wants, since it leaves *H* with less money to do with as *H* pleases (Brown and Levinson 1987). Three pupils misunderstood the task. Their answers are not included in the table or description below.

Type of interrogative	Ability	Willingness	Permission	Other
Distribution	126 (77 %)	9 (6 %)	7 (4 %)	21 (13 %)
Formulations	Can you lend me some money (...), can I borrow some (...)	Would you lend me some (...)	May I borrow some (...)	I was wondering if I could (...), do you think there is a chance (...)

**Table 3:** *Request strategies when asking a friend for a loan*

As demonstrated by Table 3, 126 pupils used a request strategy referring to ability. 49 of the request strategies were hearer-oriented, 111 were speaker-oriented, and two were impersonal. Nine questioned *H*’s willingness to lend some money, e.g. ‘would you lend me some money?’. Seven pupils asked their friend for permission to borrow money, e.g. ‘may I borrow some money from you?’. 21 pupils used other formulations, e.g. ‘I was wondering if I could’ or ‘do you think there is a chance you could’. Two of those 21 formulations were direct/bald requests, e.g. ‘lend me some money’.



46 pupils used past tense formulations, e.g. ‘could I borrow some money?’ or ‘would you lend me some money?’. Three downtoners, ‘maybe’, were counted. 99 hedges were found, e.g. ‘some money’. However, this formulation is very similar to the Scenario’s description, and this element was likely copied by the pupils. None of the pupils used negation in Scenario 3.

The requests were externally modified by 101 disarmers, e.g. ‘I promise to pay you back’ or ‘I will pay next time’. Disarmers are external modifiers which serve to “[...] [remove] any potential objections the hearer might raise upon being confronted with the request” (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989: 287). 75 grounders were counted among the data, e.g. ‘I don’t have enough money to watch the film’ or ‘there is a new movie at the cinema I want to watch’. Three preparators were found, e.g. ‘can you help me with something’. 38 alerters were counted, e.g. ‘hey’ or ‘my friend’. 17 pupils used the politeness marker ‘please’.

#### 4.2.4 Scenario 4: Asking a neighbour to talk more quietly on the phone

Scenario 4 involves *S* asking *H*, a neighbour, to talk more quietly on the phone. It is late at night, *S* is trying to sleep, but *H*’s loud chatter is keeping *S* awake. In this sense, *H* can be said to be imposing on *S*’s negative face, since it impedes *S*’s desire to sleep undisturbed (Brown and Levinson 1987). *H*’s imposition on *S* might reduce (R) of *S*’s request. The factors (D) and (P) are not stated. Seven pupils misunderstood the task, and their answers are not included in the table or description below.

Type of interrogative	Ability	Willingness	Direct	Other
Distribution	113 (71 %)	22 (14 %)	16 (10 %)	8 (5 %)
Formulations	Can you speak more quietly (...), can you be quiet (...)	Would you speak more quietly (...)	Be quiet (...), shut up (...), please stay quiet (...)	I wondered if you could (...), I was wondering if, is it possible for you (...)

**Table 4:** Request strategies when asking a neighbour to speak more quietly on the phone

As Table 4 shows, 113 of the pupils used request strategies referring to ability. All except one of the requests were hearer-oriented. The second most common request strategy referred to *H*'s willingness to talk quietly, accounting for 22 of the answers. Eight answers were different formulations of e.g. a past progressive and past tense, or formulations questioning the possibility for *H* to be quiet, as exemplified in Table 4. 16 of the requests were bald/direct. 13 of the answers also contained some form of explicit and impolite utterance, e.g. 'shut up'.

58 instances of past tense were counted among the data, e.g. 'could you be quiet?' or 'would you please talk quietly?'. 45 understaters, e.g. 'a little bit' were counted. Understaters are internal, adverbial modifiers that "[...] underrepresents the state of affairs denoted in the proposition" (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989: 283). 42 hedges, 'some', were also found. However, similar to Scenario 3, this hedge may have been copied from the Scenario description. None of the pupils used negation in Scenario 4.

94 of the pupils used an alerter to catch *H*'s attention. 102 included a grounder in the issued request. 59 instances of the politeness marker 'please' were counted.

#### 4.2.5: Scenario 5: Asking for an extra day or two to finish an assignment

Scenario 5 introduces a situation where *S* remembers just before class begins, that *S* has forgotten to complete a written assignment due for the class that is just beginning. *S* is prompted to ask the teacher for more time, a day or two, to complete the work, since *S* will not have enough time to finish it during class. Similar to Scenario 1, (D) between *S* and *H* is greater than it would be between two friends. *H* is above *S* in terms of (P) because of *H*'s authority. *S* is asking for more time, and thereby impeding on *H*'s negative face. If *H* allows *S* more time, *H* might have to change any plans s/he has to instead correct *S*'s assignment. (R), and therefore the weightiness of the FTA can be considered relatively great (Brown and Levinson 1987). Six pupils misunderstood the task. Their answers are not included in the table or description below.

Type of interrogative	Ability	Permission	Possibility	Willingness	Other
Distribution	98 (61%)	13 (8 %)	36 (23 %)	5 (3 %)	8 (5 %)
Formulations	Can I have some more time (...) / can you give me another day or two (...)	May I have some more time (...)	Is it possible to have some more (...) / do you think it is possible (...) / is there a chance (...)	Would you give me some more (...)	I was wondering if I could (...) / I was wondering if it would be possible (...)

**Table 5:** Request strategies when asking for an extra day or two to finish an assignment

Table 5 shows 98 requests referring to ability. 13 pupils asked for permission to spend another day or two on the assignment. 36 questioned the possibility for having the assignment postponed, and 5 questioned *H*'s willingness to give *S* more time. Seven of the final eight requests were formulations containing e.g. a past progressive and past tense, or present progressive and past tense as exemplified in Table 5. One of those final eight requests was a direct/bald request, 'give me more time'. 134 of the requests were speaker-oriented, e.g. 'can I have more time', 12 were hearer-oriented, e.g. 'can you give me more time', and the final 12 were impersonal, e.g. 'is it possible to get more time'.

Past tense was counted 47 times. One downtoner was found, 'maybe'. One understater was found, 'a little bit more time'. 60 hedges were found, e.g. 'some', and 'a day or two'. These hedges might be drawn from the Scenario description, like in Scenario 3 and 4. None of the pupils used negation to mitigate their requests.

Grounders were counted 144 times, e.g. 'I did not have time to finish'. 51 pupils initiated their request with an alerter, and 31 of those alerters were some form of apology for making the request, e.g. 'I'm sorry I forgot'. 37 instances of the politeness marker 'please' were counted. One pupil used a preparator preparing *H* for a request, 'I have a question'. Two disarmers were also found, 'I will deliver it fully fledged at your desk' and 'I will send it tomorrow, does that sound ok?'

#### 4.2.6: Scenario 6: Asking a stranger to move his or her bag on the bus

The final Scenario introduces a situation where *S* steps aboard a crowded bus. There is one free seat, however *H* has occupied it with his or her bag. *S* is prompted to ask *H* to remove the bag, so that *S* may sit. The factors (D) and (P) are not stated. (R) can be considered low, since *S* is asking for a small favour, counted among free goods (Brown and Levinson 1987). 11 pupils misunderstood the task. Their answers are not included in the table or description below.

Type of interrogative	Ability	Hint	Willingness	Permission	Possibility	Other
Distribution	92 (59 %)	34 (22 %)	4 (3 %)	17 (11 %)	5 (3 %)	3 (2 %)
Formulations	Can I sit here (...), can you move your bag (...)	Is this seat taken (...), is anyone sitting here (...)	Would you please move your bag (...)	May I sit here? (...)	Is it possible to sit here? (...)	I was wondering if I could (...)

**Table 6:** Request strategies when asking a stranger to move his or her bag on the bus

As presented in Table 6, 92 of the requests referred to ability. 34 pupils used an off record hint, e.g. ‘is this seat free?’ which inferred a request to sit. 17 pupils asked *H* for permission to sit. Five pupils questioned the possibility of being allowed to sit. Four questioned *H*’s willingness to let *S* sit. Two of the three final requests were formulations of past progressive and past tense, exemplified in Table 6. One request was direct/bald, ‘move your bag’. 39 of the requests were hearer-oriented. 80 requests were speaker-oriented, and 36 were impersonal.

Past tense was counted 23 times among the data. Only one downtoner was found, ‘maybe’. None of the pupils used negation to mitigate their requests. 70 pupils gained *H*’s attention with an alerter before issuing the request, e.g. ‘excuse me’ or ‘sorry’. 19 grounders were found. 3 pupils used a preparator before issuing a request, e.g. ‘is this seat free? Can I sit here?’.

## 5 Discussion

This chapter uses the results from the previous chapter to answer the research questions for the current thesis:

1. How is pragmatic competence taught in Norwegian EFL classrooms in the programme for general studies?
2. What are the teacher attitudes towards teaching pragmatic competence?
3. How do pupils modify their L2 requests?

The conducted teacher interviews found that none of ten the teachers were familiar with the term pragmatic competence. While they could give examples and reflections of what they thought it was, e.g. practical use of language, their answers were surprisingly tentative. Despite their uncertainty, a mutual assumption among the teachers was that pragmatic competence was taught and developed indirectly and unconsciously. None of the teachers stated that they explicitly and consciously planned lessons with pragmatics and the development of pragmatic competence in mind. When asked about what they thought of the current focus on teaching pragmatic competence, i.e. whether it receives any particular attention in the EFL upper secondary classrooms, their answers suggested that there is currently no clearly expressed or significant focus on pragmatics teaching.

However, the teachers' attitudes towards pragmatic competence were largely positive, despite how the interview data revealed a lack of awareness and knowledge of pragmatics, and the absence of any active implementation of pragmatics in the teachers' lessons. While there were concerns about how to specifically implement pragmatics in the lesson plans, the teachers agreed that strengthening the pupils' pragmatic competence is important and therefore should receive more attention. Moreover, the teachers said they found it interesting and helpful to reflect on pragmatic competence, which in turn made them more aware of their own current teaching practices.

Identical interview data was found by Vu (2017), in a similar examination of Vietnamese EFL teachers' perceptions and attitudes towards teaching pragmatic competence. Vu's (2017) data revealed that Vietnamese EFL teachers did not believe they explicitly addressed pragmatic competence, even though they saw its development as highly relevant. Its teaching occurred instead by chance, through other activities. Brubæk's (2013) interviews with Norwegian upper secondary EFL teachers showed similar results. While the teachers

demonstrated positive attitudes towards pragmatics, none claimed to pay attention its teaching in the classroom. The answers from the EFL teachers' of Vu (2017), Brubæk (2013) and the current study imply that pragmatics is given low priority compared to other elements of language teaching in the EFL classroom, such as e.g. grammar, syntax or lexis.

This argument is supported by e.g. Amaya (2008) and Suryoputro and Suyatno (2017) who found that L2 instruction overlooks pragmatics, and that teachers are unaware of the tools and methods they can use to consciously implement pragmatics in their teaching. This unawareness is e.g. found in T10's answers, who understood only after the interview that by teaching the pupils' polite phrases and correct greetings through personal anecdotes, T10 was, to some extent, teaching pragmatics and developing their pragmatic competence.

Amaya (2008: 12) suggests also that EFL teaching overlooks pragmatics due to a perception among teachers that pragmatics is more difficult to teach. For example, the language phenomena conversational implicature and speech act theory (Leech 1983), are perhaps seen as more challenging and less clearly defined than e.g. grammar. That EFL teaching neglects pragmatics is further supported by e.g. Brock and Nagasaka (2005: 18), who claim that in, "[...] theories of language acquisition, pragmatics has often been de-emphasized and shuffled aside under the rubric of syntactic knowledge".

As suggested by the interview data of the current study, pragmatic competence is implicitly and unconsciously addressed when the pupils are taught and practice formal writing, e.g. writing an article or an essay, compared to informal writing, e.g. writing a blog post. Pragmatic development in oral communication is to some degree addressed by forbidding pupils to speak Norwegian, as done by T1 and T4. Restricting language use to English means that e.g. T4's pupils have to carry out speech acts in their target language.

T10 and T9 also mentioned using roleplay, e.g. situations making pupils familiar with different types of language use depending on the situation. Moreover, the teachers' answers suggested that the pupils frequently learn about other cultures and the cultures' customs, e.g. through films, as T7 mentioned. These interview data resonate with Kasper and Rose's (2002: 237) argument that, "[...] [pupils] may learn from exposure to input and production of output through classroom use of the target language even when pragmatics is not an intended learning target."

Moreover, as found by Norenberg (2017), the Norwegian pupils' pragmatic competence is implicitly developed by oral tasks in English course books used in the programme for general studies during the first year of upper secondary school. Some of these oral tasks, e.g. pair and whole-class discussions about a specific topic, help pupils develop an

understanding of, for example, when to speak, and how to present their arguments in ways appropriate to that specific context. However, these tasks do not make pupils explicitly aware of why or how their pragmatic competence is being developed. In other words, the tasks do not raise their awareness of pragmatics and its relevance. In other words, their meta-pragmatic awareness, an understanding of why something is appropriate and correct, is not improved (Norenberg 2017). Brubæk's (2013) informants did not believe the textbooks used in Norwegian EFL teaching were well-equipped to develop pupils' pragmatic competence. As Brubæk (2013: 53) argues, "[...] if this is true, the content of textbooks used at the VG1 level is not in accordance with the goals of the subject curriculum".

If future EFL textbooks include explicit information about pragmatics, the pupils' pragmatic competence and meta-pragmatic awareness will, according to Norenberg (2017), be developed more effectively. Norenberg (2017) and data from the current study suggest that implicit teaching limits the pupils' experience with pragmatics to only a minor fraction of what pragmatics encompasses. Johansen (2008) and Brubæk's (2012) DCT findings also suggest that pragmatics and pragmatic competence are not given explicit focus and direct attention in Norwegian EFL classrooms, and the authors argue that pupils would benefit from explicit instruction.

DCTs used in EFL pragmatics research (e.g. Brubæk 2012; Farahian, Rezaee and Gholami 2012) have shown that EFL pupils chiefly rely on their L1 knowledge of appropriate and correct language use when carrying out speech acts in L2. One reason is based on the learners' assumption that their L1 politeness norms are universal and can therefore be successfully applied in L2 (Brubæk 2012). Compared to beginner learners, advanced language learners tend to show more frequent use of transfer, since they possess a larger toolset of linguistic resources (Kasper and Rose 2002: 153). This transfer will either be negative, i.e. unsuccessful, or positive, i.e. successful (Kasper and Rose 2002). For example, Brubæk's (2012) study revealed a common tendency among Norwegian EFL pupils to rely on and transfer L1 request strategies referring to ability, e.g. 'can I'-formulations, combined with external modification.

Brubæk's (2012) findings are reflected in the DCT data collected by current study. The pupils primarily opted for 'can I/you'-formulations in all except one of the six request-scenarios. Only two instances of negation were found in data, and past tense occurred irregularly. Combinations of past tense and progressive aspects were extremely infrequent. External modification was more frequent, such as grounders and alerters. The most frequent alerter was 'excuse me', which Brubæk (2012) categorises as a form of polite pre-request.

While categorised as an alerter, a way to draw the hearer's attention, in the current study, the use of 'excuse me' is nevertheless more polite than requests without any form of alerter (Brubæk 2012: 10).

Fretheim (2005: 145) argues that the excessively polite modifications of any utterance in Norwegian risks being "[...] misunderstood and interpreted as either ironical or servile". Moreover, too heavy modification sometimes signals a speaker's impatience and annoyance in the Norwegian culture (Fretheim 2005: 148). This argument is reflected in the lack of polite Norwegian address terms corresponding to the English 'Sir' and 'Madam'.

However, Norwegians' requests are, to some extent, conventionally indirect; "[...] a 'Can I' request [...] normally enhances our feeling that the communicator is being polite" (Fretheim 2005: 149), i.e. the speaker signals some concern for the hearer's face wants. Native speakers of English tend to internally modify their requests with negation and combinations of past tense, or past progressive aspects (Yates 2010; Woodfield 2012). For example, 'you wouldn't be willing to lend me hand a moment?' or 'I was wondering whether you had the chance to help me'.

In other words, even though the pupils in the current study demonstrate a step towards English conventional indirectness by avoiding imperatives and bald/on record requests, as for example observed in Scenario 1, e.g. 'can I please borrow a book' instead of 'give me a book', they will nevertheless be perceived as less polite than native speakers of English. The frequent use of the pupils' 'can I'-formulations closely resemble the generally assumed polite Norwegian 'kan jeg'- ('can I') formulations (Fretheim 2005), and they might therefore be interpreted as a potential case of negative transfer.

Scenario 2 was the only break in the otherwise demonstrated over-reliance on requests referring to ability. The pupils employed off record hints, e.g. 'do you know the way to the [...] hotel?' instead of 'can you tell me the way to [...] hotel?'. This strategy could be categorised as preparatory (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989), i.e. the pupils question the feasibility of the request rather than actually realising it. Since hints are more indirect and require more inferencing from the hearer, they are considered more polite than e.g. requests referring to ability (Huang 2007).

Moreover, because the illocutionary intent is not immediately apparent, the speaker can therefore state that s/he had no intention of making a request, if the hearer is for some reason offended by the inferred request (Brown and Levinson 1987). However, Scenario 2 does not by itself provide sufficient evidence of a developed, conscious awareness of correct English politeness norms among the participants of the current study.



Though the EFL users' demonstrated lack of correct, internal modification suggests a need for improving their pragmatic competence, Yates (2010) argues that researchers should be wary of what conclusions they draw from their collected language data. Yates' central argument is that, "[...] any description of native-speaker norms is likely to be a gross simplification and highly political." (2010: 290). The native speakers of English have different, individual views on what is considered polite or impolite, depending e.g. on their social context (Lenchuk and Ahmed 2014).

Moreover, it is possible that EFL learners are aware of the correct and appropriate way of realising a speech act in the target language, and that e.g. DCT data does not count as definitive evidence of lacking pragmatic competence. For example, the EFL learners might not always be comfortable with realising the speech act in the correct L2 way. For example, a heavily modified L2 request might be contrary to what the EFL learner perceives as being polite (Yates 2010). For instance, a Norwegian pupil might not be comfortable with excessive use of past tense or progressive aspects, and address terms, as they are contrary to polite Norwegian speech acts (Fretheim 2005).

While researchers and language teachers should be cautious of presenting native speakers' request as general and universal within a target language, Yates (2010: 290) nevertheless admits that "[...] language learners can benefit enormously from signposts to help them interpret and make meaning in an unfamiliar culture and context". In other words, like e.g. Amaya (2008) and Suryoputro and Suyatno (2017), Yates (2010) suggests that there should be explicit focus on teaching pragmatics to non-native speakers.

In EFL classrooms, the pupils' exposure to authentic L2 language use is severely limited (Kasper and Rose 2002), as T5 and T10 suggested. There are few, if any, opportunities for pupils to observe concrete examples of native-speakers' daily, spontaneous use of L2 (Farahian, Rezaee and Gholami 2012). Pupils learning English as a second language, compared to as a foreign language, are by contrast given more opportunities to observe and practice correct and appropriate language use.

Additionally, as found by Taghizadeh (2017), EFL pupils who study the L2 language abroad and have daily encounters with the target language in everyday situations, produce speech acts different from EFL pupils studying the language in a non-native setting. Pupils studying the target language abroad were also more successful in their pragmatic transfer of L1 politeness norms to L2 (Taghizadeh 2017). T7 stated that some Norwegian EFL pupils at the upper secondary level are presented with the opportunity to travel to England, and who thereby receive more natural L2 input.

Nevertheless, a study-abroad context does not guarantee successful pragmatic transfer, or rapid development of an EFL learner's pragmatic competence (Farahian, Rezaee and Gholami 2012). In other words, even though some Norwegian pupils are given the chance to travel abroad, they still require explicit instruction in pragmatics. Though EFL learners visiting L2 country are surrounded by authentic language use, their pragmatic competence and awareness of L2 politeness conventions will not improve unless the pupils are made consciously aware of them, and pay attention to them (Basturkmen and Nguyen 2015). Another argument for giving pragmatic competence explicit focus stems from the potential consequences of pragmatic failure (Leech 1983); incorrect pragmatic transfer of L1 politeness norms to L2:

While problems caused when non-native speakers transfer vocabulary or grammar inappropriately from a first language are usually easily identified by interlocutors and allowances made, the transfer of pragmatic norms are usually below the level of consciousness. This means that they are less visible and therefore less easily forgiven: a speaker who violates some pragmatic norm is likely to be judged negatively as rude or uncooperative rather than perceived as having made an "error" of proficiency.

(Yates 2010: 288)

If a non-native speaker demonstrates grammatically, phonetically and otherwise correct use of language, a native speaker will expect more from the non-native speaker in terms of adhering to conventional politeness norms (Yates 2010). This expectation further emphasises the importance of addressing pragmatics in Norwegian EFL classrooms. The pupils participating in the current study were able to form grammatically correct and coherent requests. In other words, their syntactic knowledge was not a hinderance to realising functional requests in L2. An example of pragmatic failure might be drawn from the interview with T1, who said that some Norwegian pupils used phrases that would paint too visible a picture for a native speaker, e.g. when asking to use the restroom. Pragmatic failure will not take care of itself, i.e. it must be addressed through explicit instruction (Kasper and Rose 2002).

Compared to beginner learners of EFL, native speakers will, based on Yates' (2010) argument, be less forgiving towards Norwegian EFL pupils' pragmatic failures. Their lack of correct modification helps support the argument that advanced grammatical competence and syntax knowledge do not guarantee effective, successful communication in a target language (Farahian, Rezaee and Gholami 2012).

Moreover, while understanding politeness norms is an important issue, EFL pupils will sometimes struggle with implicature, i.e. what a native speaker of English implies by for example a non-committal phrase such as ‘we must have lunch together sometime’. The non-native hearer responds by suggesting a date for when to have lunch, which results in an awkward situation (Amaya 2008: 17). T1 suggested that pupils will encounter metaphors and irony in American magazines they read, and that the pupils therefore are required to learn new vocabulary items. T4 stressed that pupils had to learn how to say the ‘little things’, for example how to ask for a spatula, a sentiment which implies the need for vocabulary growth.

The need for a developed vocabulary resonates with a common perception among EFL teachers is that pupils first need to develop a “[...] certain amount of grammar and vocabulary before they can comprehend and appreciate the teaching of pragmatics (Brubæk 2013: 53-54). Kasper and Rose (2002) challenge this perception, suggesting that teaching pragmatics to beginner learners of a target language is challenging, though not impossible. “Short, pragmatic routines are teachable to absolute beginners [...]” (Kasper and Rose 2002: 245), even if beginners struggle with e.g. grammar and linguistic forms. As pupils become more competent and independent language users, such as those in the current study, focus should, as Norenberg (2017) argued above, shift towards development of meta-pragmatic awareness.

Amaya (2008) suggests that roleplaying is an excellent way to develop both the pupils’ pragmatic competence and meta-pragmatic awareness. For example, T9’s pupils were taught how to conduct and carry out a formal job interview, what language to use during the interview, and how interlocutors should address each other. The pupils also roleplayed more informal situations where they used slang words. This teaching is in line with Amaya’s (2008) suggestion that roleplay informs the pupils of how contextual factors influence and determine appropriate communication. Amaya’s sentiment might find support in Brubæk’s (2013) research which suggests that EFL pupils generally ignore contextual factors or their social roles when making e.g. requests.

To address the pupils’ meta-pragmatic awareness, and the cultural awareness suggested by Lenchuk and Ahmed (2014), T9 could have followed up the roleplay with a discussion on why certain phrases and utterances are polite and appropriate, in addition to teaching the pupils a handful correct L2 phrases. Thereafter, T9 could have exemplified or given an assertion of how interviews are carried out in other cultures.

Roleplay can also be used to practice different situations with other variations in Brown and Levinson’s (1987) variables social distance and relative power (Amaya 2008: 21). Since the weightiness of social distance and relative power are highly subjective, i.e. there is

not necessarily a right or wrong answer for what constitutes a polite request, the pupils' ability to think for themselves will also be strengthened (Brubæk 2013: 56).

The formal and informal distinction in writing was also addressed by interviewed teachers. T6 and T2 found that the Norwegian EFL pupils show a tendency to produce informal English texts, regardless of the audience to whom they are writing. When teaching how to write formal texts in English, then some meta-pragmatic awareness could be achieved if the teachers pay additional attention to informing the pupils of potential reasons for why there is a distinction between formal English language compared to formal Norwegian language.

DCTs have not only been used as a method for data collection, but also as a tool in explicit, pragmatics instruction (Aufa 2012). It can be used to teach pupils different utterances for realising specific speech acts, e.g. a request (Suryoputro and Suyatno 2017). For example, pupils are made aware of different ways of realising certain language functions, i.e. improving their illocutionary competence by providing a larger toolset of expressions. For example, in addition to requests referring to ability, pupils learn to use requests referring to permission or willingness (Suryoputro and Suyatno 2017: 57). Moreover, the teacher could discuss the pupils' answers in class, where the pupils themselves are given the opportunity to present their own opinions of why certain speech acts are polite or impolite in the DCT situations.

Aufa (2012) presents five stages for developing a DCT as an effective tool for developing pupils' pragmatic competence and meta-pragmatic awareness: exemplar generation, likelihood investigation, metapragmatic assessments, piloting, and constellation development. Briefly explained, these stages suggest that teachers using DCTs for instruction should include situations the pupils are familiar with and likely to encounter. The pupils' perceptions of the weightiness of the contextual factors social distance, relative power and degree of imposition of the situations must then be assessed before the DCT is piloted, finalised and distributed (Aufa 2012: 28-29).

Takahashi (2010: 391) argues, "[...] providing metapragmatic information or certain forms of explicit intervention is most effective or helpful for learners to develop pragmatic competence in L2." This argument is supported by Nguyen, Pham and Pham (2012) who carried out a ten-week pragmatics course involving 69 Vietnamese EFL learners. The EFL learners were separated into four groups. One group received explicit pragmatic instruction, another received implicit instruction, while the final two were control groups (receiving no implicit or explicit instruction). Nguyen et al (2012) found that the group receiving explicit

instruction outperformed the pupils receiving implicit instruction. Similar findings have been made by e.g. Aufa (2014), Kasper (1997) and Ifantidou (2013).

Based on the teachers' answers and e.g. Amaya's (2008) suggestions, addressing pragmatics in Norwegian EFL classrooms might not require any revolutionary or considerable changes. As T2 realised, pragmatic competence is already to some degree present in the course curriculum, as the competence aims expect the pupil to be able to adapt his or her language to the needs of the current situation:

General politeness and awareness of social norms in different situations are also an important element. This also involves adapting the language to purposeful objectives and adapting the language to the recipient, i.e. by distinguishing between formal and informal [...] language.

(LK06 2013: 2)

In other words, an implementation of pragmatics might be less time-consuming than e.g. T5 feared. Pragmatic competence and meta-pragmatic awareness may be explicitly incorporated into existing teaching activities through small, yet helpful measures (Farahian, Rezaee and Gholami 2012). Roleplay can, to some extent, remedy the lack of authentic exposure to the target language. Lastly, as T7 suggested, authentic literature can also be a helpful tool for developing the pupils' pragmatic competence. Ideally, to help motivate the pupils, the authentic literature should let pupils "[...] encounter language that they can see themselves using outside the classroom" (Brubæk 2013: 62).

Implementing pragmatics does, however, depend on the teachers' pragmatic competence. Based the current study's interview data, there might be a need to familiarise Norwegian EFL teachers with pragmatics, some of its core components, and how to teach them, like Vu (2017) and Brubæk (2013) suggest. The current thesis is not conclusive proof of lacking pragmatic competence and meta-pragmatic awareness. More research is needed to discover whether Norwegian EFL teachers should receive instructions in teaching pragmatics, and whether lacking pragmatic competence is a widespread issue among Norwegian EFL learners.

## 6 Conclusion

The current study has attempted to demonstrate pragmatics' position in Norwegian EFL classrooms. This was done through ten teacher interviews for an assertion of current assumptions and attitudes towards pragmatic competence, and how it is taught. Additionally, the current thesis issued a DCT at the interviewed teachers' work places to observe how the teachers' answers compared to the pupils' pragmatic performance.

Based on the interview data, pragmatic competence receives little to no explicit attention in Norwegian EFL classrooms. Its development occurs instead indirectly and implicitly, mainly through instruction on differences in formal and informal written and oral language. Though the teachers showed some understanding, as they assumed it concerned concrete use of language in everyday situations, no exact definitions of pragmatic competence were given.

The pupils' pragmatic performance was also in line with prior research using DCTs as means to measure pragmatic competence. L1 strategies were transferred to L2, and while their requests were polite, their modifications differed from native speakers' modification. 'Can I/you'-formulations were the most common, and negation was counted no more than two times. Past tense forms occurred infrequently, regardless of the requests' imposition.

Regardless of the lack of pragmatics' active implementation, the teachers' attitudes towards addressing pragmatic competence were positive, and a consensus was that there is a need for more focus on its explicit implementation. These responses are in line with other, international research on perceptions of pragmatics. Compared to other language teaching activities, e.g. grammar, lexis and phonology, pragmatics is shuffled aside also in other EFL teaching contexts outside of Norway.

However, the teacher sample is relatively small and does not represent all Norwegian EFL teachers' attitudes towards or implementation of pragmatics. It is possible that e.g. lower secondary EFL teachers are more focused on developing pragmatic competence or possess more solid knowledge of what terms and theories pragmatics encompasses. Additional research must be conducted to assert whether this is the case. Similarly, though 166 pupils answered the DCT, random sampling could for instance have improved the representativity of the language data. Nevertheless, the current study may lend support to existing and potential future pragmalinguistic research calling for giving pragmatics and pragmatic competence explicit attention in EFL classrooms.

## **6.1 Suggestions for further research**

Additional interviews in other geographical parts of Norway could be conducted to address the issue whether pragmatic competence receives more attention in other levels of Norwegian EFL education, e.g. primary school or lower secondary school. The current study was a single-moment study, and it may perhaps be beneficial to examine how teachers' attitudes develop over time through a longitudinal study, for example following an interview with a researcher. Observation is also a potential method for asserting the pupils' pragmatic competence, as this allows to e.g. prove or refute teachers' claims during interviews, for example that pragmatics is addressed.

A future researcher could conduct roleplay over multiple sessions to observe the effects of explicit instruction of pragmatic competence, e.g. combined with whole-class discussions and DCT language tests. A development of the pupils' meta-pragmatic awareness and pragmatic competence might perhaps then be demonstrated by comparing their initial pragmalinguistic performance to a control group, and to the pupils' demonstrated performance at the end of the study.

Moreover, the current study measured EFL pupils' request modification. It is possible that the pupils who participated in the current study possess more advanced knowledge of how to realise contextually appropriate and correct apologies or e.g. demands. Future studies might therefore benefit from including a wider range of speech acts, such as apologies, refusals, compliments, demands or complaints to better ascertain pupils' pragmatic competence.

## References

- Alasadi, Mahdi (2012). Teachability of Pragmatic Competence: The Impact of Explicit Instruction on the Development of Iraqi Freshmen EFL Learners' Pragmatic Competence. *Journal of Arab Gulf Studies* 40(1&2), 21-48.
- Amaya, Lucía F. (2008). Teaching Culture: Is It Possible to Avoid Pragmatic Failure? *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses* 21, 11-24.
- Aufa, Fauzul (2012). The Assessment Tool of L2 Learners' Pragmatic Competence: Written Discourse Completion Test (WDCT). *Journal of English and Education* 6(1), 24-31.
- Aufa, Fauzul (2014). The Use of Discourse Completion Task (DCT) as Explicit Instruction on Indonesian EFL Learners' Production of Suggestion Acts. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)* 2(6), 1-10.
- Bachman, Lyle F. (1990). *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Basturkmen, Helen and T. Thuy Minh Nguyen (2015). Teaching Pragmatics. In Anne Barron, Yueguo Gu and Gerard Steen (eds), *The Routledge Handbook of Pragmatics*. New York, NY: Routledge, 563-574.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana, Juliane House and Gabriele Kasper (1989). Appendix: the CSSARP Coding Manual. In Shoshana Blum-Kulka, Juliane House and Gabriele Kasper (eds), *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 273-294.
- Briggs, Charles L. (1986). *Learning How to Ask: A Sociolinguistic Appraisal of the Role of the Interview in Social Science Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brock, Mark N. and Yoshie Nagasaka (2005). Teaching Pragmatics in the EFL Classroom? SURE You Can! *TESL Reporter* 38(1), 17-26.
- Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson (1987). *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brubæk, Silje (2012). Pragmatic Competence in English at the VG1 Level: To What Extent Are Norwegian Students Able to Adapt to Contextual Demands when Making Requests in English? *Acta Didactica Norge* 6(1), 1-19.
- Brubæk, Silje (2013). *Pragmatic Competence in the EFL Classroom. An Investigation of the Level of Pragmatic Competence among Norwegian EFL students at the VG1 Level*. Master thesis, University of Oslo.



- Cohen, Andrew D. (2010). Coming to Terms with Pragmatics. In Noriko Ishihara and Andrew D. Cohen (eds), *Teaching and Learning Pragmatics: Where Language and Culture Meet*. Harlow: Longman, 3-20.
- Crystal, David (2008). Pragmatics. In David Crystal (ed), *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. 6<sup>th</sup> edition. Oxford: Blackwell, 379-380.
- Deda, Nivis (2013). The Role of Pragmatics in English Language Teaching. Pragmatic Competence. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies* 2(4), 63-70.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán (2003). *Questionnaires in Second Language Research: Construction, Administration, and Processing*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Farahian, Majid, Mehrdad Rezaee and Afshin Gholami (2012). Does Direct Instruction Develop Pragmatic Competence? Teaching Refusals to EFL Learners of English. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 3(4), 814-821.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. César (2012). E-mail Requests to Faculty: E-politeness and Internal Modification. In Maria Economidou-Kogetsidis and Helen Woodfield (eds), *Interlanguage Request Modification*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 87-118.
- Fretheim, Thorstein (2005). Politeness in Norway: How Can You Be Polite and Sincere? In Leo Hickey and Miranda Stewart (eds), *Politeness in Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 145-158.
- Goffman, Erving (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essays in Face-to-Face Behaviour*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Gray, Samuel (2005). *Kalde Nordmenn? Norske Høflighetsnormer i Kryskkulturelt Perspektiv*. Master thesis, University of Oslo.
- Grice, H. Paul (1975). Logic and Conversation. *Syntax and Semantics* 3, 41-58.
- Hillocks, George (2005). Qualitative versus Quantitative Research: A False Dichotomy? In Richard Beach, Judith Green, Michael Kamil and Timothy Shanahan (eds), *Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Literacy Research*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 33-46.
- Huang, Yan (2007). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Huang, Yan (2014). *Pragmatics*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ifantidou, Elly (2013). Pragmatic Competence and Explicit Instruction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 59, 93-116.

- Jebahi, Khaled (2011). Tunisian University Students' Choice of Apology Strategies in a Discourse Completion Task. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43(2), 648-662.
- Johansen, Stine H. (2008). *A Comparative Study of Gratitude Expressions in Norwegian and English from an Interlanguage Pragmatic and Second Language Acquisition Research Perspective*. Master thesis, University of Oslo.
- Kasper, Gabriele (1997). Can Pragmatic Competence be Taught? (NetWork #6) [HTML document]. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center. Retrieved from <http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW06/> [14.10.2018].
- Kasper, Gabriele (2008). Data Collection in Pragmatics Research. In Helen Spencer-Oatey (ed), *Culturally Speaking*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. London: Continuum, 279-302.
- Kasper, Gabriele and Kenneth R. Rose (2002). *Pragmatic Development in a Second Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kasper, Gabriele and Shoshana Blum-Kulka (1993). Interlanguage Pragmatics: An Introduction. In Gabriele Kasper and Shoshana Blum-Kulka (eds), *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 3-17.
- Kim, Heesoo (2008). The Semantic and Pragmatic Analysis of South Korean and Australian English Apologetic Speech Acts. *Journal of Pragmatics* 40(2), 257-278.
- Koike, Dale A. (1989). Pragmatic Competence and Adult L2 Acquisition: Speech Acts in Interlanguage. *The Modern Language Journal* 73(3), 279-289.
- Kusevska, Marija, Biljana Ivanovska, Nina Daskalovska and Tatjana Ulanska (2016). Profiling Pragmatic Competence of Foreign Language Learners. *Romanian Journal of English Studies* 13(1), 79-90.
- Leech, Geoffrey N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Leech, Geoffrey N. (2014). *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Lenchuk, Iryna and Amer Ahmed (2014). Teaching Pragmatic Competence: A Journey from Teaching Cultural Facts to Teaching Cultural Awareness. *TESL Canada Journal* 30(7), 82-97.
- Levinson, Stephen C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LK06 (2013). *English Subject Curriculum: ENG1-03*. Retrieved from <https://www.udir.no/kl06/ENG1-03/Hele/Timetall?lplang=eng> [1.10.2019].

- Nguyen, T. Thuy-Minh, Hanh Pham and Tam Pham (2012). The Relative Effects of Explicit and Implicit Form-Focused Instruction on the Development of L2 Pragmatic Competence. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44(4), 416-434.
- Norenberg, Maria (2017). *Pragmatic Competences in Oral Textbook Tasks*. Master thesis, University of Bergen. Retrieved from <http://bora.uib.no/handle/1956/15940> [1.11.2018].
- Norwegian Centre for Research Data (2017). *Schools and Kindergartens*. Retrieved from [http://www.nsd.uib.no/personvernombud/en/help/research\\_topics/schools\\_kindergartens.html](http://www.nsd.uib.no/personvernombud/en/help/research_topics/schools_kindergartens.html) [19.4.2018].
- Perry, Fred L. (2005). *Research in Applied Linguistics: Becoming a Discerning Consumer*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Rajabia, Shima, Akbar Azizifara and Habib Gowhary (2015). The Effect of Explicit Instruction on Pragmatic Competence Development; Teaching Requests to EFL Learners of English. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 199, 231-239.
- Rounds, Patricia L. (1996). The Classroom-Based Researcher as Fieldworker: Strangers in a Strange Land. In Jacquelyn Schachter and Susan Gass (eds), *Second Language Classroom Research: Issues and Opportunities*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 45-59.
- Røkaas, Felicia A. (2000). Potential for Misunderstandings: Social Interaction between Norwegians and Americans. In Maria Isaksson and Felicia A. Røkaas (eds), *Conflicting Values: An Intercultural Challenge*. Sandvika: Norwegian School of Management BI, 111-129.
- Savic, Milica (2014). *Politeness through the Prism of Requests, Apologies and Refusals: A Case of Advanced Serbian EFL Learners*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.
- Searle, John R. (1974). *Speech Acts. An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seliger, Herbert W. and Elena Shohamy (1989). *Second Language Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Srisuruk, Patana (2011). *Politeness and Pragmatic Competence in Thai Speakers of English*. Doctoral dissertation, Newcastle University. Retrieved from <https://theses.ncl.ac.uk/dspace/handle/10443/1189> [12.10.2018].
- Suryoputro, Gunawan and Suyatno (2017). Pragmatics Role in the EFL Teaching to Indonesian Junior and Senior High School Students. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics* 4(2), 53-59.

- Szczepaniak-Kozak, Anna (2015). Interlanguage Pragmatics in Academic English: Analysis of Requests Produced by EFL Learners. In Magdalena Zabielska, Emilia Wąsikiewicz-Firlej and Anna Szczepaniak-Kozak (eds), *Discourses in Co(n)text: The Many Faces of Specialized Discourse*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 353-384.
- Taghizadeh, Reza (2017). *Pragmatic Competence in the Target Language: A Study of Iranian Learners of English*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Salford. Retrieved from <http://usir.salford.ac.uk/42206/> [5.11.2018].
- Taguchi, Naoko (2009). Pragmatic Competence in Japanese as a Second Language: An Introduction. In Naoko Taguchi (ed), *Pragmatic Competence*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 1-18.
- Takahashi, Satomi (2010). Assessing Learnability in Second Language Pragmatics. In Anna Trosborg (ed), *Pragmatics Across Languages and Cultures*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 391-421.
- Trosborg, Anna (1995). *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints, and Apologies*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Vu, Ngoc M. (2017). *Teaching Pragmatics in English as a Foreign Language at a Vietnamese University: Teachers' Perceptions, Curricular Content, and Classroom Practices*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Sydney. Retrieved from <https://ses.library.usyd.edu.au/handle/2123/16157> [31.10.2018].
- Woodfield, Helen (2012). I Think Maybe I Want to Lend the Notes from You. In Maria Economidou-Kogetsidis and Helen Woodfield (eds), *Interlanguage Request Modification*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 9-49.
- Yates, Lynda (2010). Pragmatic Challenges for Second Language Learners. In Helen Woodfield (ed), *Pragmatics Across Languages and Cultures*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 287-308.

## **Appendix A: Interview guide**

**What are your immediate thoughts when you hear the term pragmatic competence?**

(Hva er dine umiddelbare tanker når du hører begrepet pragmatisk kompetanse?)

**What is your view on the relevance of pragmatic competence in English for Norwegian pupils?**

(Hva er ditt syn på pragmatisk kompetanse i engelsk og dets relevans for norske elever?)

**What do you think of the current focus on teaching pragmatic competence? (Is there a lack of focus on teaching pragmatic competence, or is there perhaps too great a focus?)**

(Mener du det er mangel på fokus på opplæring i pragmatisk kompetanse, eller er det kanskje et for stort fokus?)

**How do you teach your pupils how to be pragmatically competent in the English language? Do you explicitly focus on it during some classes? Is it something you do not actively teach?**

(Hvordan lærer du dine elever å være pragmatisk kompetente i engelsk? Har du et eksplisitt fokus på dette i enkelte timer? Er dette noe du ikke aktivt underviser i?)

**Do you have a rough estimate on how much time you spend per week, month or year on teaching pragmatic competence?**

(Har du en omtrentlig idé om hvor mye tid du bruker på å undervise i pragmatisk kompetanse per uke, måned eller år?)

**What are your final or concluding thoughts?**

(Hva er dine siste eller konkluderende tanker?)

## **Appendix B: Discourse completion task (DCT)**

*Please read the six scenario descriptions below and fill in your answers in English. Please write an explicit response, for example “give me the pen,” instead of “I would ask nicely for a pen”.*

**Scenario 1:** You are in class, but you forgot to bring your textbook. The teacher might have one you may borrow. How do you ask him/her?

**Scenario 2:** While visiting London, you somehow manage to get lost. You need to ask a complete stranger for directions back to your hotel. How do you ask for help?

**Scenario 3:** There is a new movie showing at the local cinema, but you do not have enough money to afford seeing it. A friend of yours, however, might be willing to lend you some money for it. How do you ask for a loan?

**Scenario 4:** It is late at night and you are trying to sleep. Your neighbour is talking loudly on the phone outside your window. This is keeping you awake. How do you ask him/her to speak more quietly?

**Scenario 5:** Just before class begins, you remember you have forgotten to complete a written assignment due for today. There is no chance you have the time to finish it now, so you will have to ask your teacher for an extra day or two. How do you ask?

**Scenario 6:** You get on the bus, and you notice there is only one free seat. However, someone’s bag is in the way. How do you ask the person to move his/her bag, so you may sit?

## Appendix C1: Interview 1 transcription

Key:

R = researcher, I = interviewee, [( )] = translation, [ ?] = interpretation, ( ) = reaction, [ ] = edit, -- = signals self-correction during speech, eh = signals sound made during speech, ... = signals pause made during speech

**R:** So, the first question is, what are your immediate thoughts when you heard-- hear the term pragmatic competence?

**I:** Actually, I had to think about that to see what, what it means. Eh, in school, students learn all sorts of different competencies, and actually to be pract-- pragmatic, which I relate to being practical, and eh, I think it's a very important competency for them to learn, actually it should be in the læreplan [(subject curriculum)]

**R:** Yeah, yeah [you see it as?] very important.

**I:** No, but I think as teachers it's our responsibility to teach them, eh, I include lots of, eh, etiquette, eh, social rules and, yeah, decency, clean up after yourself, eh, those kind of things, I think they are very important because I don't think they're always taught in, at home.

[The interview is interrupted by someone else entering the room, recorder briefly paused]

**I:** So again, pragmatic competence when it comes to the speaking of the students. Eh, we do talk about that a lot in, eh, in the sense that it comes up in the textbooks. And also, eh, i-- it's just proper, as I mentioned before, etiquette. Because, eh, there are cultural differences that I have noticed through the years, and I make it very clear to point out to the students, eh, certain things that, eh, you get a reaction when you hear something and you think it's not supposed to be that way. I don't like-- I've never liked being called by the first name, because where I grew up it was missus so and so, and actually, in some ways I've calmed down about that. Eh, I feel that it puts the students at my level, and when the students ask to go to the toilet, I'm like, in English you would never ask for the toilet. I said it paints too visual of a picture and people get uncomfortable with that. And my [family member] just freaks out every time that I say it in America. Because I do have a tendency now to take these Norwegian, eh, what do you call it, ways of speaking ba-- to America with me. Eh, and also, but especially [snaps fingers] the one thing was the clicking of the finger, the pointing, duuu [(youuu)] duuu [(youuu)], and I was like, eh, I'm always very quick to point out, in English, we don't do that.

Eh, plus, you know, some-- it's not even just the little basic things like that which can be considered rude, and actually here in Norway is totally acceptable, eh, it's also, eh, writing. The formality of writing. When we write in English, eh, we're much more formal than my Norwegian, eh, colleagues, I have in Norwegian. And this is interesting for me to find out through the years, because, some things are very obvious like the du [(you)] instead of excuse me, and, eh, which we would have in English, and other things are not as obvious. So, there's a lot of stuff I've learned through the years about, eh, the different cultures. It's very cultural.

**R:** Yeah, it would seem like th-- the, kind of a chief difference is the directness of how we address someone, formally and pointing at someone, there's-- there's a big difference between how direct you are, and...

**I:** And the words that are used, the formality of it. And also, I mean, of course, like I said, in the textbook, there's many different parts which talks about how you, eh, you write in different-- eh, for an article, or, eh, an informal blog, or that kind of thing, the different styles. But in speaking there's definitely a difference based on the situation that you're at. And we've talked about it, discussed it, in the sense of Facebook, and, students write in dialect, and they don't have any punctuation, and, and I tell them, you know something, again, in a sense of putting stuff out there that's always gonna be out there, you look like an idiot. (Laughter)

**I:** So, it's, you know, you should at least-- eh, the minimum, have punctuation. So, eh, no, so, but I-- we have some really good conversations about that kind of stuff too.

**R:** That's very good. But we-- we've kind touched down upon this now by, by, with the question, what is your view on the relevance of pragmatic competence in English for Norwegian pupils, eh, and I think you've briefly said—you've said that it is relevant, eh...

**I:** Yeah and also, eh, you know, but also, I always to remind them I'm giving them the American perspective. Because, eh, it's interesting for me, being an American living in Norway, is that I have met, eh, British friends, and I've met Australian friends. And, we all have different ways of saying similar things, eh, how you going? I thought, what, what? And then also, we were just recently in Ireland, and one of my pet peeves in English has always been the th-sound. They don't pronounce the th-sound in, in Ireland. They have the t-sound all the time so I was laughing with my students because they know how picky I've been about that th-sound, [oh?] it just ruins it for me. And, eh, and then I'm hearing the Irish, and I go well I have to remind my students that they don't need to speak Irish, or if they want speak Irish, they have to speak, everything has to be Irish, not just the th-sound. (Laughter)



**R:** Yeah, be consistent about it.

**I:** Yes, because I guess I have to have room for, eh, not having a th-sound and making that just the t-sound, because in Ireland that's what they do. But, but then they have to be consistent about their language. No, but, pragmatic, it's-- it's very important because you need to address people in a way that they're accepted, especially if you're wanting to get something out of it. Eh, these students are gonna be going on to university, they're gonna need to appease teachers, and, eh, colleagues in the future, and, eh, secure a job. And so, if they don't approach the situation in a proper method, then of course they are gonna be screwed.

**R:** I have looked at examples of pupils, or students, then, who have written e-mails to university professors, and some of them have been... you would have shook your head if you had seen them. Eh, they were so direct, and, and, it, it was as if they were talking to a friend.

**I:** But it's interesting that students are becoming more direct. Because I don't see that.

**R:** They are, I think they are.

**I:** There's a good possibility, because the influences of American media on these kids is just, it's, it's amazing, the changes that I've noticed just in the last ten years of being in school. So, eh, it's an advantage to a certain degree, but also as I've talked about with gaming, eh, students, eh, I love it whenever I have students who are gamers, eh, as long as they do their homework of course, but, eh, at the same time, I have to remind them and, I think they accept it, when I say, yeah, you can speak in English because you-- you're a gamer, and you said-- but you speak with a limited vocabulary and now you need to expand your vocabulary to address other things and to be able to, yeah. Everything has its own vocabulary. So...

**R:** Alright, next question. Eh, what do you think of the current focus on teaching pragmatic competence, in, in Norwegian schools. Do you think there's, like, is there an explicit focus, do you feel, or is treated, eh...

**I:** I wouldn't have ever thought there was a focus.

**R:** No?

**I:** No. In, in, what I've, the meetings I've gone to and stuff, I don't feel that I've ever heard, eh, that talked about. Eh, it could just be my schools that I've worked at, eh, I feel like there's so much focus on the læreplanmål [(teaching aims)] and the kompetansemål [(competence

goals)] and this and that. And, again, they're so, eh, vague and they're so open that it allows for us to, to, eh, design it the way that we like, and I have a tendency to do that all the time as I mentioned earlier, but, eh, I-- I believe... I'm a, I'm a [mother], and, I like to think that... (laughter) I tell my kids, if I fuck you up just a little bit less than my parents have fucked me up, we're doing good (laughter). So, we just, we just need to improve each generation just a step at a time.

**R:** I am so tempted to quote that in my thesis. (Laughter)

**I:** No, but that's always been my goal. It's like, I wanna do a better job than my parents, but I'm not gonna set the, the, the level so high that I feel like I've never succeeded. I just, I just need to do it a step better than my parents. And, and I feel my attitude towards raising my [children], I did not plan to have [more than one child], so be careful there. (Laughter) but I don't regret it one place, eh, but anyways, eh, but having, and also, I'm really fortunate as well because I was a [mother] before I became a teacher. I came to Norway with a master's degree and I was gonna work [elsewhere]. And I'm glad that I didn't, because having the influence of having those children, and like, my husband and I like to joke that, eh, we had [a pet] before we had kids. Because that way we make the mistakes on the [pet].

**R:** Yeah, that's a good idea.

**I:** Child-raising mistakes, we made it-- the [pet] got to be king, the [pet] got everything [it] wanted, and we have an... an unruly [pet]. So, eh, it was good that when we had the kids we had more boundaries. And, eh...

**R:** That's good advice.

**I:** Yeah, and then I had, and then I became a teacher, and so I feel that the advantage I've had of knowing students, and knowing how, eh, the societies [point?] and seeing how they interact, I was always active as a coach and stuff. But that helped me a lot to see what they're struggling with. And I think it's important to address those issues in the class, because, eh, recently I was taking, eh, a shared class with a colleague and [this person] has a different way of teaching than me. And, eh, when I came into the class, the students realized that it was me having them that day, and, they sent me, one of them sent me a message on behalf of the whole class and asked me specifically to not ask them questions and ask them to read. Out loud. So...

**R:** Ok. (Laughter)

**I:** They, they did not, and, and then I was shocked, and I sat there for a few minutes and wondered what, how am I gonna deal with this? And am I supposed to talk the whole entire time? I mean, they're in school, aren't they supposed to learn? And, so, I, I really was stunned, I just didn't know what I was gonna do, I was dumbfounded. And, so then I said to the students, ok, without hanging, you know, taking a Norwegian phrase, hanging her out, without, eh, showing who she was and whatnot, I, eh, said to the students, eh, as far as I understand, there's many of you who don't like it that I'm, eh, making you guys read out loud, and asking you questions randomly and expecting you to have-- come with answers. Eh, how many of you agree with that? And everybody raised their hand, and I go, see, everybody hates it. We're all on same par, you know, so now there's no problem. I said, everybody is in the same boat. So, we're gonna continue like we usually do.

**R:** That's your strategy, yeah.

**I:** I said, you guys are at school, and you see that it's not just you, because I think very often, students go through and always think if they have a problem, it's just them.

**R:** Yeah, it's just them, yeah.

**I:** But here I made it, everybody aware that everybody hated it. There was not one student who liked it.

**R:** Very good strategy.

**I:** And so my attitude has always been fake it to you make it. And, I have a big speech with the students in the beginning in the year and I say now you are starting high school, you have the chance to be the person you want to be, and you can take the baggage that you're bringing from junior high school and you can take out a few of those things and chuck them. And just pretend that they're not an issue. Because if you pretend they're not an issue, the shyness, and, eh, the uncertainty, then they won't be.

**R:** Do you think this, eh, this, you talk about this shyness will go away, would that help them with pragmatic competence?

**I:** To a certain degree, but, actually you know something, a colleague of mine just came with an article yesterday that was in the Norwegian Utdanning [Education], and, I actually, I wanna download that article and it talks about girls, pre-- predominantly are the ones who don't wanna have presentations for a-- people, in front of a class. They don't want to, eh, raise their hand, they don't wanna contribute because they are embarrassed. And those girls, they

are findings, statistically, be-- take lower paid jobs, they don't advance in education, they never stick out for themselves, and so it's, it's creating a society of, eh, students who are limiting themselves. And so, and I feel if they can learn to that in high school, it's amazing. And the thing is, is, eh, I let them know in the beginning of the year that all of them are in the same boat. And, then uncertainties that come with the hormones and all that, whatnot, and, and also being thrown into a new class at a new school with these different students they don't even know, eh, and I hope that... eh, but also, I make the classes in such way. English is a second language. I have to remind myself of that sometimes, because the students speak really well. Eh, they don't always write as well, and I try to help them to build up the foundation so that they can write better, again, English is much more formal in written than the Norwegian. Eh, the way that we build up our texts, you guys have the argumentative, and we have argumentative, but we also have a persuasive, and persuasive and argumentative are two different texts whereas they're both tied together, eh, combined in the argumentative Norwegian texts. So, I have to make sure that I have clear definitions of the differences, and I've been... learning a lot about this as well, eh, because I don't wanna confuse the students. And I think it's hard for them, when they have English and Norwegian at the same time and these guys have certain desires for their texts, and I have certain demands for my texts, and so, but, so, I try to really show the differences so that it's clear for them. And then, when they have their oral presentations, for example, I like to, eh, I divide the class in two... to make it less, eh, stress for them, so there's only fifteen students who come at a time. And then, eh, the people who do it first, to encourage motivation to get students to volunteer, I let them go. You're done, go, quickly. And then the class gets smaller, so in the end, there's only four or five students, but the last four students have to all stay. Because I feel it's really important that all the students perform for someone.

**R:** That's good, yeah.

**I:** And if I do have the, eh, occasional situation where there's a student who had suffered severe anxiety or whatever, you pick one or two people, but I still am determined that it's important that they do it. I said, these are uncomfortable situations. And it's important we learn to p-- take ourselves out of our comfort zone, and not always have our way, because in life you're not gonna get your way.

**R:** Yeah, I agree.

**I:** My whole goal with high school and, in, I use English as the medium to, to, to teach them, is, in my classes there is so much pragmatic, eh, compliance, because I want them to learn to be good people and to grow. That's my goal, is if they grow. And if the teachers are just letting them have their way, because [unintelligible] said and this and that, and I get so frustrated because I have a friend who's a psychologist and she says, even if you have the severe anxieties and stuff, we still, the goal is still to push them a little bit. But, again, I don't make them have a... for thirty people, but they can do it for three or four, or self-chosen people.

**R:** That's very good, I agree with that. Because not having them perform in front of an audience that's not doing [unintelligible] and I mean...

**I:** You're contributing to the problem.

**R:** In school, if there's one place, one time in life where you're allowed to feel like you fail or make mistakes, it's here.

**I:** It should be here.

**R:** You have a huge net around you which will catch you and put you back on your feet if you stumble.

**I:** And also, they see other people are struggling with the same thing. I always like to make it clear to everybody that you're not alone. But there's so many students who have this. But, that, that, gives them, eh, comfort to know that it's just not them. So, but I'm, but it takes time. And you have to fight against the contact teachers and then you get the letters from the parents, and you have to justify it. And, but again my purpose and my intention for all these kids, through all these years, is to help them grow as people. And to get the confidence that their parents didn't give them. Especially working at [another school] when I was [there], you see the students who have been, eh, in Norwegian, sviktet av samfunnsskolen og foreldrene [(let down by school and their parents)]. I mean, they have-- they have not gotten what they deserve to have. And that was help. And especially when you hear from them, because I'm very hands on with my students, I'm talking with them individually, especially at [another school] because it was smaller classes so it allowed for more freedom. When you have, eh, a good relationship with your students, they'll deliver. I got students to, to pass English when they were failing Norwegian. And I said, three lines does not count for, when I ask for a whole page, that, that's not gonna keep for a two. Sorry. I said, dårlig kvalitet så må du ha

kvantitet [(if the quality is poor, you must have quantity)] (laughter). And, and they deliver. And, and the more they wrote, you see that, eh, over time they get better. And they were shocked. And I mean, trust me, I read a lot of crap papers. They talk about prostitutes, and they talk about drinking beer, and when they tell me they had nothing to write about, I tell you, ok, in Christmas holiday of course you've done something. Yeah, I slept. Okay, who did you sleep with? How did you sleep? I don't want any sex details (Laughter) but, where'd you sleep, how was it, how long did you sleep. Use these words, find questions, and give me sentences. And they would.

**R:** That's good.

**I:** And they keep it G rated, or PG, I think it'd get the PG sometimes, but (laughter) and drinking, ok, you drank all, your whole holiday. Ok, what did you drink, who did you drink with, how much did you drink, where did you drink, how was it, did you feel fine the next day? I mean...

**R:** Tell me something.

**I:** Give me some details. And they were shocked. Because they never had a teacher who encouraged them to talk about drinking or sleeping.

**R:** I think they enjoy that, you know, it feels the distance between the teacher and the pupil it doesn't feel so, I don't know, artificial.

**I:** No, you're meeting them where they are.

**R:** [unintelligible] I had a teacher who talked about [unintelligible] we were russ [(pupils in senior year of upper secondary school)] at the time, so he used to talk about the time when he was that, and, eh when he went out drinking and he said, well hopefully I won't meet any of you in the city, passed out drunk. And I'm like, yeah, sure. (Laughter)

**I:** Oh, I've joked with the students too about, yeah, like when, you guys, you know, when you guys begin drinking and they're sixteen year olds, and everybody laughs because I know they're all they're all drinking already. And I mean, seriously, eh, but like I said, eh, my students like, yeah, when you have an open relationship then you have the ability to, to get to know them in a different way and they'll, they can maybe share things with you when they're struggling. And, and also [unintelligible] for help.

**R:** Should we, eh, I think have, well... three quick questions left. Eh, how do you teach your pupils to be pragmatically competent in the English language? Do you explicitly focus on it in some classes, or is it something you do not actively teach?

**I:** Eh, I definitely actively teach it in different ways, but when it comes specifically to the English language, of course, that comes up, eh, definitely in situations, again, when, eh, it, it doesn't-- it comes up spontaneously, and then it also comes up through the texts. Eh, I, I like to talk about the students, eh, when we, when we read stories and literature, and asking them, eh, you know, what they think about that, what their opinions are, eh, I try to get them to discuss things. Because, eh, as I've told them, we read literature to help us learn to be better people, and to help us learn to, eh, adjust to situations that are uncomfortable, and we learn about ourselves. And we learn about our opinions on things, because, very often it puts words on, eh, feelings that we have, that we didn't know we had. So, eh, and all of these things are practical, very practical for them. Because in life, when they start to understand-- and again, like I said, making everyone aware that everybody is nervous. Eh, at [another school] I said to the students, eh, like, you know if you guys had to take the English exam, the majority of you would not pass. So, but you do have a chance to pass with me, but I do demand that you actually put in effort into it. And, because I met them at their level, they were there. So it depends on the situation, but of course, every opportunity I have to use texts, eh... I have several girls in my class and [another class] suffer from depression, and, and a lot of it is contributed, I think it's contributed, or actually I should say, is not contributed to, but it's not help that they're so social media addicted. And this video I had today, I showed it in a way with the intention of, and I told them, I prefaced it with that this video will tell us about the problems of social media, but necessarily, eh, and this, you may actually feel that this hits you, that it relates or it may relate to other people that you see around. Or this may be completely new information. I said, that the thing is, is in life we can never begin to fix any problems or issues with ourselves unless we're aware that there's a problem. And so that awareness was really important, so, but, I, this video it hit me, because I know that two of my [pupils], eh, really suffer and I'm hoping that maybe hearing that this is, that this is an epidemic, will help them to maybe kind of reflect a little bit and to, to get help. So, again, it comes up in the topics, it comes up in the book, it comes up in situations. And also, sometimes I'll come across things myself, because there are things outside the classroom that I think, eh, it's important to talk about. But again, when they're speaking English, then, it's

practicing English skills, they're learning about English cultures, they're learning about, eh, people, they're learning about the skills that will take them further in life.

**R:** Yeah. Yeah, I suppose this [unintelligible] kind of a difficult question to answer. Do you have a rough estimate on how much time you spend per week, month or year on teaching pragmatic competence? You said it, it comes up in textbook, and I think it's kind of hard then to keep track of, well, this was a specific task focusing on pragmatic competence.

**I:** You know something, as much as, eh, again, if we both agree that pragmatic competence is helping these students to be better people in general. And helping them to adjust to situations in conjunction with English, and, eh, other-- I feel that it's not just English. Eh, English will be a huge part of their lives, there's no doubt about it. In today's society, I mean, they all need it. Eh, the interest in students taking English above and beyond VG1 is growing because students are seeing it. And also, as I've informed them, it's use it or lose it. Just because you've had it for ten years, doesn't mean if you stop taking it for two years that you're gonna be, eh, equipped to do the English that you're gonna have to do in university. And the books are becoming more and more English because they're not using the money to translate them anymore. And, so you're gonna have to be aware, and able to attack those situations. Eh, reading strategies we've gone through is attacking, eh, English in, eh, situations they have to read in authentic texts. It was a really good project, if you ever want it, let me know. But, eh, because it is teaching them reading strategies because when you read an American magazine text, they have so many metaphors, they have visual images, they have symbols, they, eh, idioms, they have, eh, sarcasm and irony, and all of these different aspects which American people understand, but Norwegians would have a hard time understanding. And, eh, but I should give them the tools to learn to decipher, decipher this information, so that, because when they get those textbooks, and they're starting talk about, exercise physiology or something that is so foreign to them, they're gonna need the tools to be able to do it. But as a, as a whole, I would say... and I think I'm being a little, eh, low, but I did twenty-five percent.

**R:** Twenty-five percent, yeah.

**I:** Because like I said, I like to, eh, help them, and pragmatic competence in English, you know some-- I think pragmatic competence in life, but, because we're speaking English it is all English related. And, but I'm quick to give them an American viewpoint of a lot of things as well, because like I said, in my interactions with British speaking people I know they have



a different way of dealing with it. So, I can't give them the pr-- always the pragmatic, British version.

**R:** But you can give them the American version.

**I:** But I give them the American. And then the business, how you interact with your colleagues in business, and, eh, from my experiences and, and the way that you dress. Eh, so there's a lot of different things.

**R:** Yeah, the way you talk to your colleagues [unintelligible] well that brings me to the final question.

**I:** And cellphones.

**R:** And cellphones (laughter) yeah. What are your final or concluding thoughts?

**I:** About?

**R:** The pragmatic competence, the things we've discussed.

**I:** No, but actually, you know something, having this conversation is really cool. When you go to different kinds of courses in school and stuff, it, it giv-- it puts the, it gives me the vocabulary that I need, it gives me the, eh, the reflection that I think as teachers is not always we know we're doing when we do it. And we think, very often subconsciously I know I have a reason for doing what I do. But, when you actually put words on it and have said it out loud, and you have a, eh, way of justifying what you're doing, it makes me feel more confident in what I'm doing.

**R:** Puts a very different light on, on what your thoughts are.

**I:** But then again, I'll be honest, I'm a teacher who does reflect on, from year to year, what worked, what didn't work. And, I think it's important, I think it's sad, I'm sure a lot of people don't do it. I've had so many colleagues who the students have asked, as I was contact teacher theirs, their contact teacher, eh, can you please talk with [another] teacher to ask [this person] to do a different, something different. It's always power point, and it's always talking and it's en oppgave [(a task)]. It's the same old, same old. And they actually, ok, yes, ha-- do you have suggestions, they came with suggestions. And yeah, [this person] was not open to implement any of these changes. [This person] just went with the same thing. So, I think it's sad when you have teachers who aren't, don't reflect from year to year. And, eh, and so, so, I'm not, it, and also I'm not gonna say that everything I do is right (laughter).

**R:** Ninety percent. (Laughter)

**I:** But I like to get confirmation or affirmation or whatever it is, when I actually feel that what I am doing is right. And... I mean, I have a very good repu-- eh, not reputation, but I have, eh, a good, eh, relationship with my students. So, I think that what I'm doing is right. And I think that I'm in a position that I can ask them the tough questions and talk about the elephant in the room when other people, eh, put it under the carpet.

[Interview is concluded]

## Appendix C2: Interview 2 transcription

Key:

R = researcher, I = interviewee, [( )] = translation, [ ?] = interpretation, ( ) = reaction, [ ] = edit, -- = signals self-correction during speech, eh = signals sound made during speech, ... = signals pause made during speech

**R:** So, the first question is, what are your immediate thoughts when you heard-- hear the terms pragmatic competence?

**I:** (Clears throat) Well, I'm thinking about my, eh, my students, because I do use, eh, I'm a student myself, eh, but, eh, I'm thinking about how I am... eh, employing this in my classes, since I've been teaching for a few years now and I'm thinking pragmatic English, what does that mean. How, eh, it can be taught, how it can be used, how, eh, how does it fit, obviously, in the curriculum. Because it's, eh, our, sort of, eh, primary document that we have to... we are subjected to it, on, on--

**R:** They're our rules basically, you have to follow them.

**I:** Right, so there's one, one thing, but how, how we, how we use it, and how we, how we teach our students to, to use English, eh, in practical manner, and then there are the rules that we have to obey to. And if it's, if, if they are, some-- somehow compatible. I hope that was an answer.

**R:** Yeah, absolutely! If you would just in some way brief way try to explain your understanding what is pragmatic competence?

**I:** When, when it comes to language teaching, right? Or?

**R:** Yeah, yeah, well, or in a broad sense what is it when we're talking about language and pragmatic competence. You have different competencies, you have grammatical competence and so forth, how does pragmatic competence fit in here?

**I:** I would, I will think of how, eh, so we have grammar. How can I use it when I speak and when I write. We have vocabulary, and a lexical, eh, knowledge. How, how can I use it when I have a, [unintelligible] a presentation or if I'm writing a text. Or, how, how, how is it important to me? How can I improve it perhaps. Eh, how, eh, pragmatic competence, how can I put to use the texts that I experience along the way. Because I'm gonna read a newspaper,

I'm gonna read a, I'm gonna read an encyclopaedia entry, I'm, I'm gonna read a blog post. How, how, how can I use my knowledge of English when I, eh, I don't know, read or write or speak or listen.

**R:** Yeah. Eh, we have a, one, one, one way to just roughly define pragmatic competence, is the ability to use language appropriately and flexibly in a social, any given social context. And, eh, and eh, it's... the distinction between, well, h-- how can you be pragmatically competent in the English language, eh, and is there a difference from being pragmatic competent in English compared to Norwegian? So, so, knowing that, what is your view on the relevance of pragmatic competence for Norwegian pupils when learning English?

**I:** Well, I, I think it's, I think it's very, eh, interesting, h—here in our school, eh, some of my colleagues, eh, focus specifically on very formal use of English language. Specifically in writing. Eh, so you're not supposed to use the informal phrases, you're not supposed to write as if you were speaking to a, to a friend, et cetera. And I think that, eh, teaching specifically Norwegian students, eh, where Norwegian is not my first language either, eh, I find it, I find it actually very interesting, because, eh, this use of language is different. And, I, eh, I have to explain to my students specifically, ok, what is, eh, in the curriculum, you know, there is a competence aim, eh, in communication and in writing you're not to, to, eh, adjust your text and your communication to the specific situation. So, are you writing this-- at, the essay that you're writing, is it formal enough. Is it, is it really adapted to the situation, I mean, are you writing this as a, for a, eh, fairly educated person to read, or are you writing that for, for a person, to, to, I don't know, to read while they're watching a TV-series or a football match, you know, just like as a side entertainment, eh, and there is a difference, I mean, obviously, I'm... I think that Norwegian students are, are, are, eh, used to be more or less formal, eh, you can think of it a challenge if [thought?] of as a problem, but, but I, eh, I just try to point out to them that, eh, you need to think of the level formality when you express yourself. Both in writing and in, eh, and in speaking. I don't know, I'm, I'm trying to answer your question, but not too broadly, sort of, but, but, I, I hope it was some sort of answer?

**R:** I, I think you're doing a very good job so far. Absolutely.

**I:** Ok, right.

**R:** Yeah, because you, you do see it as relevant. They have to be aware of this, that, are you being formal now, or are you supposed to be formal as opposed to being informal, and there's a sensitivity to these issues.

**I:** Yeah, At the same time we have to remember that the society is changing and, and obviously we are not (clears throat) for instance a level of formality when they approach me, their teacher, in their speech is gonna be different than for instance if it would, was a British students. I used to have British students here as well, they were much more formal in the way they were addressing me. Eh, and obviously, it is a f-- they are affected by the culture where, or of the culture where they come from, whereas the Norwegian students were, would just, roughly, call me by my name, and, eh, come here.

**R:** Yeah, regardless of whether they were talking to you in Norwegian or English.

**I:** Oh, yeah, and there is, there are no polite phrases, there's nothing to it, you know. So, so there's, this (clears throat) pragmatic use of language is, eh, I think it transpires in every, eh, way we communicate, I guess, eh, and there are also challenges to the fact that they are, that the Norwegian culture is perhaps less formal.

**R:** Yeah, I would definitely feel that way. The Norwegian culture is a lot less formal, and we're a lot more, more, perhaps, I think, direct.

**I:** At the, yes, at the same, at the same time, I, eh, perhaps [clears throat], it depends on how, how broad is the scope of your, your interview and et cetera, but, but I would give it to the pragmatic, I don't know, eh, use of English, the more than just a formal, informal distinction. But, eh, I, I know that it is a big focus. Yeah, definitely.

**R:** But what do you think of the current focus on teaching pragmatic competence in school. Is there a lack of it, or is there too much of it? Is it pushed aside?

**I:** Eh, I, I think I can only discuss the, eh, up-- upper secondary school, eh, because it has been some years now since I've been in the lower secondary school and... perhaps... I, I might be wrong in my assumption, I, I, I, I, I would think that the pragmatic use of English is more visible and, eh, more often taken to use in the lower secondary school, but I am, I am saying just due to my... experience, eh, eight years ago, there, eh, but no, I, I think pragmatic, eh, language use is definitely present. I mean, just have a look at the curriculum, you will see that, eh, many of the competence aims are actually, eh, the awareness of the student of adjusting their ways of communication to, eh, to the specific situation, and I mean, in order to do that, they have to know how to use the language, so we have to, so we have to teach them that. Eh, would I say it's the primary focus, no. But it's definitely there.

**R:** Well, that's, that's good I think, it's that, if not [explicitly?] expressed it's still something you think about, yeah, it's still present.

**I:** Yeah, definitely.

**R:** Right. Well, eh, how do you then teach your pupils to be pragmatically competent in English language? Any concrete tasks, or... is it actively taught?

**I:** Eh, yes. Actually, we do. Eh, it is actively taught. Eh, having that said, I mean, if I would show you the, eh, the textbook that we use, the amount of the tasks that are specifically designed to teach them the awareness of [unintelligible] the genre or the formality or, you know, it's, is limited. Eh, very much so. Eh, so very often I have to use NDLA or, eh, and other books, but, but I remember that we-- we've had sessions that were specifically designed to teach them this, this awareness. Eh... they found it odd. They weren't used to that, it was new, and, and then they told me that-- oh, actually that's, that's an interesting thing now that I think about it, many of the students told me that they haven't had that before. This, eh, formal-- formal, informal distinction. Eh, so now when I think back on my answer on the previous question, maybe, maybe we do focus more on that in the upper secondary than in the lower? Because I remember some of the students telling me that, we haven't had that before. Eh, so yes, we, we have had some sessions. At the same time, I, eh, I think I, eh, I've had those sessions, but not under the pressure, but, but, having discussed with my colleagues here, which know have a very big focus on just this issue. And it is present, yeah.

**R:** Well, this could be a very tricky question, admittedly.

**I:** Oh my god.

**R:** (Laughter) Do you have a rough estimate on how much time you spent per week, month or year, teaching pragmatic competence? And I realise that this might be-- be very difficult to answer, like, with a concrete figure.

**I:** Specific estimate? No, I cannot give you that. Eh, I, I don't think, I, no, I mentioned a few sessions, so that's, perhaps some sort of estimate, you know. A few, how, how many is that, four, five, six, you know. And sessions, I was like, an hour and a half, eh, so you could probably calculate that. Eh, but at the same time, you know, some students work faster and then they will get some more tasks from me, so they will probably feel this intensity a little bit different than those students that work very, eh, slowly and carefully, and, and note everything carefully in their notebooks. I cannot give you an estimate.

**R:** Yeah, but you did say that it's, it's, it, it's, it has a presence. I mean, it's something you think about and something that's addressed, so... that is in and of itself an answer, I think. And, eh, and by that we've reached the final question, which is a simple one, I think. Finally, eh, what are your final concluding thoughts concerning pragmatic competence and teaching, or your attitudes towards it, or...

**I:** That's, that's very interesting, I mean, eh, I assume you work on that, because you yourself find it interesting and important, and perhaps you work on that because, eh, you yourself find... yeah, the, well the, the significance of it is maybe lacking in the s-- in the I-- in the school system in Norway? That could be, that could be the reason why you're, why you're researching it. And then I'm guessing that perhaps you would try to shed light on that specific part of teaching. I w-- I don-- I don't know, but, but, eh, you, you know it's, eh, what are my final thoughts? My final thoughts is that language is in perpetuate change, and it's very difficult to teach a language, you know, based on curriculum, I mean, thankfully, they are, there are, eh, they are being revised now, as you ob-- obviously know, and, eh... because language is so much, and language is changing and, and I'm teaching my students that their pronunciation or the, eh, vocabulary, i-- is in constant change. So, how come our curriculum isn't, you know? So it's, it's, eh, I would say that it's fairly outdated on some of the areas, but, eh, I'm guessing that the point of this is to, yeah, shed light on perhaps the lack of (laughter) eh, the lack of teachers practicing the pragmatic, eh, competence in schools, I don't know, that might be wrong assumption, eh, but, but again, eh, my, I would throw the ball back to you, and tell you that, eh, I think, I mean my primary, eh, concern is the fact that language is this-- it's like water, it's like river, it's, it's never the same, you know. Eh, so to teach students that are going to, eh, study later, because that's the kind of school we're at, eh, how, how do I, how do I prepare them to, eh, to meet those challenges and the fact that they're gonna use language in ma-- many different situations. That's my, that's m-- that's my concern. And, is pragmatic, eh, teaching, or pragmatic, eh, use of language the answer, is my conclusion. With a question mark there. (Laughter)

[Interview is concluded]

### Appendix C3: Interview 3 transcription

Key:

R = researcher, I = interviewee, [( )] = translation, [ ? ] = interpretation, ( ) = reaction, [ ] = edit, -- = signals self-correction during speech, eh = signals sound made during speech, ... = signals pause made during speech

**R:** First question, what are your immediate thoughts when you hear the term pragmatic competence?

**I:** Well, at first, eh, I, I [thought?] it had something to be, eh, had to something to do with being pragmatic, and, and do something useful and, eh, perhaps, eh, if it's about teaching, then, eh, well teaching students how to do a thing pragmatically, when it comes to, sort of, what we're gonna learn, but, but, after some more explanation then I, I know it's, eh, it's more about, eh, how to use language properly or, eh, well, usefully. So that, I think that's what I think about that.

**R:** What is your view on the relevance of pragmatic competence in English for Norwegian pupils?

**I:** Yes, eh, well, I, I, I think it would be, would be relevant when it comes to, eh, how they, well, if they're ever gonna address anyone, let's say they're gonna address a teacher or [then to use?] or and then when it comes to, well, asking things too, to use please, eh, but also to, eh, to know what level of formality to, to, eh, to use when it comes to write letters, write articles, eh, and the-- make sure that I know that there's a difference between talking when they're mates or, or chatting online, and then have a more academic approach. I think that's, eh, what I think about that.

**R:** Yeah. So, so there is, there is some, there's ro-- some relevance at least that should be...

**I:** Yeah, I think, I think it, I think it's relevant. Eh, if not, not every day, because, because I think when, well, what I, what I, what I, my reflection are-- eh, my reflections are, perhaps that, eh, well, i-- if I was to teach another language, let's say German, eh, more, eh, a language, eh, where, where the students have, eh, the students have less competence, let's say, than they have in English, then, then this could also be sort of like a, not a tourist approach, but, but more, eh, to do the language work practically. That you're, eh, imagining situations when ordering food and, and stuff. But, but in English, eh, I think, what, what, the level, eh,



we're at, I think that, the level we're on that, eh, well, we, we have more discussions of, of more thematic, eh, kind, and, and, but, but it's, it's part of the, sort of like the, the universe a competent language user, but, but when it comes to assessment in situations where, let's say they're having an oral presentation or, or, eh, or they're writing an essay, then, then it's important to me that they know sort of level of formality and, and, so that it should, well, it, it wouldn't, eh, well I think it could at least, eh, well, if I handed it over to an English, English teacher, and so on, then it wouldn't be any... well, they could to see that it's an academic text that would suit in their country as well. And also, preparing for them, because some, some may study abroad, and, and, and not only go as travellers or tourists and so.

**R:** Yeah, different purposes. Yeah. Eh, I think you then stepped on to, to, or at least approach the next the question--

**I:** Oh, sorry. (Laughter)

**R:** No, no, no, that's, no, no, it's good, eh, but it would seem you've already kind of addressed the, the question of what do you then think of the current focus on teaching pragmatic competence, eh, its position in the classroom.

**I:** Do you mean, like, what I think about it in the classroom, or do you think more like what's in the curriculum?

**R:** Yeah, its current standing [unintelligible]

**I:** Yes, in the, in the subject. Yeah. Eh, well, eh, let's, if level of formality is, is part of that pragmatic competence, then that's very much in focus, I think, is that, because the students are, are, normally very competent at, eh, chatting, whether it be like on computers or, or just talking themselves. And they're good at making themselves understood, eh, between, eh, peers. But, but, eh, well, as otherwise, eh, well I don't think it has... too much focus at least, eh, perhaps, eh, not so much focus in, in, because, because as I said, eh, more of a thematic--thematic kind of approach, perhaps, and also, the issues we're focusing on are let's say, well, we're focusing on indigenous people, and, eh, let's say Maoris and, yeah, and, so it's, I don't know, and also, when it comes to the English sub-- subject, then it would be, there would be hundreds of ways, of, of approaching that pragmatic competence whether you're in New Zealand or in America or in Great Britain and, but I think it's good to know some basic rules, like, eh, well, let's say, eh, how to be-- that you're polite, and, and addressing people in a polite way. And then...

**R:** In at least a, a breezy manner, like you have some idea, yeah.

**I:** Yeah, and, and then take it from there I guess. (Laughter)

**R:** Yeah, absolutely. Eh, might be a tricky question, how do you teach your pupils to be pragmatically competent in the English language? Do you explicitly focus on it in some classes, or [unintelligible] or do you not actively teach it, is it sort of ornamental?

**I:** Yeah... that is a tricky question, that, eh... well, I don't think I would say that I ever, well, today we're gonna... focus on how to behave or how to speak, I, I never do, do that. But, eh, I need them to be aware of the different levels of formality at least. And that sort of, but I guess that's more when it comes to, eh, to, for them to be able to distinguish between the different modes, eh, to, to, to address people, and also, eh, I think, I think that's mainly what we do. Eh, well, it could be that texts, let's say the textbook would, eh, would, eh, focus on what is it, what is being British. Let's say that. And there would be perhaps a paragraph telling that they're, they're, well, they, they say please, and they, they line up very neatly in queues and all that.

**R:** Exceedingly polite. (Laughter)

**I:** Yeah, so, and that's also kind of a, a competence then is pragmatic, eh, also, not only, perhaps how you, how you speak, but also how you, sort of, arrange yourself in, in lines and stuff (laughter), but other than that, I think... yeah, eh, I've, I've taught also international English, and we've, we've, eh, therein remember we, we focused a bit on, that was film, I guess, it was, eh, Lost in Translation, and it was, about, yeah, about Japanese I think, and, and those kind of issues. Eh, but that's, eh, well, I, I haven't done that in a while, so, so, but, eh, because the thing about English is that you, you have the, you have all the, as I've said, you, you would meet also English as a lingua franca and then what to focus on then, then it must be more a sort of a global, eh, kind of politeness, but, yeah.

**R:** So, even if it doesn't come up, like, explicitly, on a day plan, it will, it'll appear like naturally, or...

**I:** Yeah, I think it so, and, eh, but if you came into my classroom, I guess, well, eh, if you were, oh [unintelligible] and that, I guess you would perhaps tick it off when it comes to when, when we're preparing for an assessment, eh, and so on, eh, especially oral, that I, I, that they're not supposed to use slang words, and, and, and stuff, like that.

**R:** Yeah, don't write an e-mail to a professor saying, yo dude, what's up.

**I:** No, and also, if you, if you need to choose between, eh, sort of these three words which, which is the most, more formal, and [unintelligible] yeah. So I guess the focus is more on that.

**R:** Yeah, very good. And then, well, the next question then is, is, do you have a rough estimate on how much time you spent each week, month or year teaching pragmatic competence, and you, you've more or less answered that. It'll, It'll come up, in some way. Yeah. And this is also a question which, eh, it is difficult to really answer how much time you spend on something actively, because it's very difficult to keep track of.

**I:** Yeah.

**R:** But it seems to me that there's at least an awareness-- awareness of that this is going on in class in some way. Final question, this one is, is very tricky, eh, what are your final or concluding thoughts? (Laughter)

**I:** Yeah (laughter), well, to sum up, in conclusion...

**R:** Like, how would you, when you think about pragmatic competence, what are your attitudes? Do you think it's...

**I:** Let's say that... eh, half an hour I didn't have much attitudes towards it, but (laughter), but now as I'm, eh, as, as we've been talking about, and I've been a bit conscious about, what it is, and... at least what I think it is, then, then, I guess it's... well, I think that if we were going on a, let's say, a study trip to, eh, the UK or the US, then I guess, eh, me as a teacher, bringing them over there, would, would, I would have to go through with them, oh so, just so you know, you, you need to say please, remember, and all that, and so... Perhaps I would do a bit more like in the daily situation there, but, but, as I said, and I've said more times now, it has mostly in my class, classes to do with formality and, and how to, and, adjusting language according to the situation.

[Interview is concluded]

## Appendix C4: Interview 4 transcription

Key:

R = researcher, I = interviewee, [( )] = translation, [ ?] = interpretation, ( ) = reaction, [ ] = edit, -- = signals self-correction during speech, eh = signals sound made during speech, ... = signals pause made during speech

**R:** The first question is, what are your immediate thoughts when you hear the term pragmatic competence?

**I:** Pragmatic competence... my immediate thoughts are that you need it, students need it, and, eh, pragmatic-- I understand it as, eh, you say something to achieve something. For example, can you open the window, or, could you pass me that or-- not analysing poems or, eh. I've lived in Germany as well, and what I've experienced is that, at university when we, we spoke German and we read books, and we talked about history and stuff, that I didn't know how to say, eh, where is the spatula, or, eh, you know, the easier things that you say around the kitchen table, for example. So I really noticed the difference between, like, formal German, and also the, the little things that you need in everyday life. So I think pragmatic English is more little things that you need to say, sort of, yeah. That's my understanding of pragmatic.

**R:** Yes, yes, I think you're onto it because pragmatic competence, and pragmatics in, in particular is about, eh, the definition of pragmatics, a very brief one, is the study of invisible meaning, such as when you say, can you open a window. Eh, that's a very direct request, whereas you could have said, well, it's a bit stuffy in here. That would have implied, that, could someone open the window, right. And so pragmatic competence is, is perhaps an awareness of how to, how these things are communicated in different contexts, and use... a sensitivity to how can I say this, for example as a tourist in England without offending anyone. But, it's, it's definitely, you said, it's use of language, it's actual realisation of language.

**I:** Yeah, and that's something they have to learn as well, because we are probably fairly indirect, we could say, for example, eh, you're wearing your shoes. And by that we mean, take your shoes off.

**R:** Exactly.

**I:** I don't know what an English person would do, they would probably [indirect?] as well, wouldn't they? Not German.

**R:** They would probably lay even more, I, I-- they are very indirect, at least that's the general tendency, eh, in particular when it comes to asking for help. I think there, they will be-- you have two types, just to explain briefly, of politeness, one that concerns positive face and negative face. Positive face is saying nice things, compliments, so forth. Negative face is respecting that this person has other things to do, I don't want to impede on his freedom. And they would probably direct the attention towards the positive face, saying that, well, you look nice today, or, eh, you're such a good person, you've all these nice qualities, et cetera, et cetera, and, and try to, to modify their request, to, to limit the attack on his positive face. Eh, but what is your view on the relevance on pragmatic competence in English for Norwegian pupils?

**I:** It's important. My students they only speak English. We do a two period time in the beginning of the year, and they have to speak English. They have three strikes. There are eight hours put together, the lessons, and, if I hear a student say something in Norwegian that's one strike, they have three strikes.

**R:** That makes me so happy. (Laughter)

**I:** And that's because I want them to say all the little things in English as well. Pass me the book, which page, eh, is the tasks on, yeah, stuff like that in English as well. And if, if they make it, I, I, I bring a cake.

**R:** Wonderful. (Laughter)

**I:** And it really works, because they say to me now that English is, has become a lot easier, it's become a lot easier to speak English because they have to. Everyone does it.

**R:** You won't do them any favours by letting them speak Norwegian in class.

**I:** I don't. If they do, they bark at them, literally.

**R:** Yeah. Well, do you bake your own cakes?

**I:** Eh, Toro. Yeah, so almost. Almost.

**R:** At least it's not store bought, like, that's good, I think.

**I:** That would be expensive.

**R:** Yeah, it would. Probably. What do you think of the current focus on teaching pragmatic competence? And then I've added in a parenthesis, is there a lack of focus on teaching pragmatic competence, or is there perhaps a too great a focus?

**I:** Is there a lack of focus... I think in the lower secondary school, yes, there is too little focus on it, because I know, several students say that we never had to English, and sometimes even the teacher didn't speak English. I mean, you only speak English when you answered the tasks. Then you don't learn English properly, I think, but, I don't wanna talk other teachers down, absolutely not, but I think maybe in lower secondary school they should also try and speak more English, to learn pragmatic English. I know, this school, every student in every class have to speak English. And I, so I think, I think, I don't think we reflect on it, like, explicitly, but I think we do it implicitly, and expect them to speak English. Eh, we don't talk about it, no, is there too little focus on it... no I don't think so, because we do it implicitly, I think.

**R:** Yeah. So it is there, even if it's not, like, explicitly discussed, you know that, it, it sort of enters the scene when you do-- when you complete your tasks, when they talk in class together, yeah.

**I:** Yeah. And they also can't leave the classroom without asking for permission in English.

**R:** Yes. And do they ask, can I leave the classroom, and then you say, well, can you?

**I:** They ask me, can I, and I answer, yes you may.

**R:** Yes, you may. Yeah. Yeah, that's a very typical formulation by a Norwegian pupil to say, can I, or can you, instead of may and so forth.

**I:** I should probably be a bit more strict.

**R:** Maybe, I don't know.

**I:** Because they learn to say can I when they say that to me all the time.

**R:** That's a difficult question because I think that pupils are—they're not really impolite as such, they don't ask I want to leave the classroom, or they don't say, I'm leaving the classroom, right, so they have one way of being what we call conventionally indirect. It's... it's enough, right, it's just about enough. You won't be entirely polite, but you won't be exactly polite either.

**I:** They don't say please either.

**R:** They don't say please?

**I:** No, they sort of just, can I got to the toilet. And, and usually there's so many things happening I just say, yes you may, and don't have the time to correct every single one.

**R:** Yeah, exactly. We've sort of discussed this, I think, the question, how do you teach your pupils to be pragmatically competent. Eh, it, we talked about it enters the scene. How it's sort of woven into the other things you do. Eh, rather than explicit focus, so, eh, I think it's okay to skip this question. And the next one, which asks, do you have a rough estimate on how much time you spend per week, month or year on teaching pragmatic competence. Eh...

**I:** I don't know, I've, I've, eh, I've made them aware that the reason we only speak English is to, is to learn how to say all the little things in English as well. But I've only said that, and never said it again, so, that took maybe two minutes. But we spent more time on pragmatic English than two minutes because they do it every day, sort of.

**R:** But I, but I think compared to other teachers I have visited, eh, your pupils probably speak a lot more English than the others do. Yeah, without saying anything more than that. We've actually worked through this sheet quite quickly, because you've answered these questions in a very concrete and nice way. We haven't talked around it, I feel we've, we've concentrated on these questions alone. So, we already reached question which is, what are your final or concluding thoughts about pragmatic competence, and, then perhaps, your own attitudes towards it, perhaps other teachers' attitudes towards pragmatic competence. What do you think?

**I:** I think we should reflect on it more. And also, say, tell the students explicitly that the part of learning English is to learn the pragmatics of English, as well, eh, talk more about it, and compare, we will say this in Norwegian. What is the counterpart in English, that maybe you've seen, the, eh, there's list in Norwegian, hæ, hæ, hæ, hæ, hæ [(what, what, what, what, what)], and in English [it's like?] could you do this, blablabla. Yeah. And, and to show them stuff like that and to, yeah. Yeah, be more explicit, I think, yeah, keep doing what we're doing, but... say, formulate the reasons why... make them more aware of it. I think basically that's something we should do.

**R:** I think that's a good sentiment, actually, the awareness part. To, to become aware that there is a difference between how I say this in Norwegian and how I'll do it in English. Eh,

because, even if, even when I've learned English for, for many years, when I do visit England, there are still times when I feel like I've, I really made a big mistake there by asking this way, or, behaving in, in a certain way. And, my, my, [unintelligible] supervisor he said the same, he said the same, he's, he's [unintelligible] in England I think, and even after so many years, there's still times when he feels I don't really know how to behave correctly in this particular context.

**I:** Yeah. We talk a lot about it in German class actually, but not in English class, so I should do it in English as well. It's a lot easier in German, because if you don't use the polite verbs for example, then you, you will offend them.

**R:** [In particular?] the Sie [(you)] When you-- that should always be used, shouldn't it, when you talk to strangers, at least, yeah.

**I:** Yeah, and your professors, which I didn't, once. And he literally just, what did you say.

**R:** Have you read any e-mails to professors, like college professors or university professors, from students. Some are, are, just... what... you know, you see someone addressing their professor by, hey, man. Other than... yeah.

**I:** Oh my god. No, no, you have to be polite always. I-- it's much better to be too polite than not polite. It can be a bit stilted, but still they, they understand your intention, that you want to be polite.

[Interview is concluded]



## Appendix C5: Interview 5 transcription

Key:

R = researcher, I = interviewee, [( )] = translation, [ ? ] = interpretation, ( ) = reaction, [ ] = edit, -- = signals self-correction during speech, eh = signals sound made during speech, ... = signals pause made during speech

**R:** What are your immediate thoughts when you hear the term pragmatic competence?

**I:** Pragmatic competence... eh, honestly, I'm not even one hundred percent sure I know exactly what it is, but I'm thinking it's about, eh, using English in practical terms, like everyday use, eh, yeah, the day to day basis, not the necessary-- necessarily the, the formal requirements or in clo-- closed sessions and stuff like that, but more like the, the natural part of the language.

**R:** Yeah, yeah, you're definitely on to it about the practical use of the language. Because, it is about concrete use of language, as means to an end, to achieve something, but it's... the definition briefly stated is, eh, the use of language appropriate to a given context. Eh, so say if I were to apologize for something, how would I do that in a setting with these people I don't know, versus how would I have done it in a setting with friends and so forth. So it's kind of like a sensitivity to, to these issues, regarding...

**I:** Contextual, right, okay.

**R:** Yeah, contextual, social... and those kinds of things. But I think, you are definitely on to it by saying it's a practical use. Because it is use, it is actual use of language, language realisation. Eh, but knowing this, what is your view on the relevance of the pragmatic competence for Norwegian, eh, pupils, in English as a foreign language.

**I:** Well, I mean, it depends, because there are different, you know, different, eh, classes. Some are, eh, yrkesfag [(vocational studies)], and, eh, most likely they'll, they won't use that much English in their work. Th-- they don't have a need to, to learn all the, you know, the formal rules and the formal... and I mean, so on. So, they're gonna, their use of English is probably gonna be limited to a lot of, eh, just practical use and everyday use, like you said, and, but then again you have other, eh, programmes, like, eh... the general studies which most likely are gonna go on to study universities and get jobs where, eh, English is required at a higher level. Eh, but I definitely think, either way, you need some form of, eh, knowledge about it,

or, like, picking up on social cues and culture and stuff like that. Eh, setting, reading a, you know, reading a room, basically, and, and adapting your language accordingly. So, eh, I think it's a good thing to practice. I don't know if we do it explicitly, eh, but I also feel like they get a certain input, at least to a certain degree watching TV-series, watching movies, stuff like that. That's probably better than me teaching them, because it might feel a little bit forced. And it's difficult to create a setting, a natural setting...

**R:** Yeah, it feels artificial, doesn't it.

**I:** Right, so the natural-- it's difficult to create a natural setting.

**R:** And also, creating a situation where you're supposed to learn this explicitly, you, you, as you say, it's not realistic. Things would arise in a natural conversation that won't appear in a classroom, unexpected stuff and that kind of thing. But what then do you think of the current focus on teaching pragmatic competence, eh, in Norwegian classrooms, you, you, I think you sort of, you began talking about it by, it's not taught explicitly, but it's kind of there.

**I:** Yeah, it's, I mean, you're shown-- you try to show the difference between formal writing and formal speech, and informal... like letters to a friend, letters to a, or a applying for a job, or whatever it is, eh, so that's... part of it. Eh, but, eh, I think a lot of, a lot of, eh, the curriculum, is, is based on, eh, cultural knowledge, so learning about different cultures and different countries, and... so that's, I guess that's a part of it. A lot of the curriculum is, you know, eh, moving towards that more and more.

**R:** Yeah. I actually think with the revision coming of the current curriculum, there will be an increased focus on these cultural aspects. Eh, as, as far as I know, anyway.

**I:** Yeah, no that's true... I mean, also the test, we just had one before Christmas where one, one task was to, eh, and this also goes into literature and how we use that, because in the revised version, I think, you're supposed to use literature to, eh, to teach knowledge about culture and so on. So the task was also, eh, directed towards that, the task, it said something about using the literature and the film or the movies or novels and so on, you've used in the, in the course so far, and explain how they broaden your view, or gave you knowledge about culture or made you understand the world, or opened your eyes to certain aspects that you didn't know before. Eh, so reflect around that, how does literature and movies help us do that. And I also think that's, eh, probably gonna be on the next test, next exam. There's a lot of focus on it.

**R:** I think, yeah, I think that sounds good. I've, I've read some studies done about politeness issues when it comes to pragmatic competence, and student emails to professors, and it seems like maybe there could be a lack of, of awareness, eh, of how to be polite in certain settings. Especially in, in foreign language, because some of them would address the professors by, hey, man, or something. Eh... but, but I think that...

**I:** I mean the school system is always different, in, in different countries. We never say ma'am, sir. Whatever, we just say the teacher's name. And that would be just outrageous in other countries. I mean, I would, yeah, well, if you're like really comfortable with the teacher, you have a, you know, a, if, if you have like this humour or going on, then you can, maybe you can call him hey, man, or dude or whatever, but, yeah.

**R:** So, I also have a question, do you have a rough estimate on the time you spend per week teaching pragmatic competence, or year, but I realise since it's not taught explicitly, that's gonna be, well, maybe impossible to answer.

**I:** Yeah, I mean, that's difficult to answer. Eh, like I said, it's more... indirect, eh, I definitely, I see it as a part of it, because, eh, like I said, most of them only gonna use-- some of them only gonna use-- the, they're gonna need the pragmatic competence, because they're-- that's basically what they're gonna use. Eh, but, I couldn't tell you. Eh. Yeah.

**R:** Do you have any final or concluding thoughts about, maybe your own attitudes towards pragmatics, eh...

**I:** No, I mean, I remember once when I was at uni, that a professor said that, eh, it's, it's how do we evaluate, eh, the oral part of a language, because what is the goal, what is the end goal... is it to have the perfect, you know, pronunciation, and when you, or is it what you're actually saying, and, eh, what you're actually... how you... eh, adapt, how is your, eh, pragmatic competence. So, there's different parts of the, of the evaluation, and it's... I try to balance that, so that I try to see, eh, their strong suit. What are they good at. So if their content isn't necessarily, you know profound, reflected, and so on, then I'll try to, eh, highlight their pronunciation and so on. Eh. So, yeah.

**R:** Because that's a question, how explicitly should this be focused on, I mean should we devote an entire lesson to it and say, today you're gonna learn how to be polite.

**I:** Yeah. I don't know, it's difficult, because like we talked about earlier that, it's difficult to create a natural environment for them to happen, so... I mean, eh... for me right now, I'd--

there's probably smarter people out there who can something about this, but for me it's, it's difficult. Because you also have to get through, you know, everything you have planned, all the exams, the... and so on.

[Interview is concluded]

## Appendix C6: Interview 6 transcription

Key:

R = researcher, I = interviewee, [( )] = translation, [ ?] = interpretation, ( ) = reaction, [ ] = edit, -- = signals self-correction during speech, eh = signals sound made during speech, ... = signals pause made during speech

**R:** So, my first question for you is, what are your immediate thoughts when you hear the term pragmatic competence?

**I:** Well, I think of everyday use, really. Eh, but I'm not sure if that [unintelligible] idea, but, eh, using language not in a classroom only, eh, on that, that purpose alone, but also in order to communicate in real life, and, and I'm just guessing that's what it is about, but I haven't really looked up the word. I should have, so I don't know a definition, eh, so this is just, no, me taking a guess.

**R:** Yeah, well, you're not the first one to not have looked up a definition so (laughter), you don't have to feel bad about that. But, the, the, generally, I think you, you're on the right track, you're saying it's about actual use of language. It is. It is about actual language realisation and explicit use of it to achieve some purpose or another, but, but, eh, an example of a definition, a very simple definition is the, the correct use of language, or, or the ability to adapt your language use to a way that suits the context and the purpose, so you sort of, you know, that, eh, for example, in a group of people I don't know, and I need to ask someone for a favour, how to I ask them, eh, for that favour without stepping on anyone's toes or coming across as being very rude or [presumptuous?] or something like that. So, it's the actual realisation, which you've said, outside the classroom, and it's the ability to adapt to different contexts, eh, and, and then knowing this brief definition, what then is your, your view on the, the relevance of the pragmatic competence for these Norwegian pupils?

**I:** Oh, I think it's very, eh, relevant, because, eh, what we try to teach our students, for instance, when it comes to writing, is that, when you write a text you have to keep in mind, who are you writing to. It's not-- it's never your teacher. So, you have to, you know, make up an audience per say. And, whether or not it's formal, informal, and what sort of language you use, what sort of, eh, knowledge does your audience do you presume they have, and stuff like that, so, eh, because that's something you also need to, to take in consideration, when, in real life. Eh, whether it's writing a paper, eh, at the university or if it's, you know, just sending a

mail to order something or to comment or something or, you know. Eh, [well, but?] also, eh, I think that today's students tend to, when it comes language and also when it comes to the Norwegian language, but to some extent also the English language, they tend to be really informal, I mean in Norwegian we know they use, eh, more of a dialect than it-- the written form of the language, and in English they, they don't really understand the difference between formal and informal, eh, and don't understand the purpose of it, why we need to formal sometimes, and sometimes it's ok to be informal, eh, and, I-- in late-- later years, especially after '06, we focus a lot on, eh, knowledge, eh, and, and the creating writing has sort of disappeared in, in upper secondary at least. Eh, I think there's been one or two exams the last ten years that's involved any sort of creative writing, and, we've over focused, I believe, on five paragraph texts, and, when it comes to writing, that's what they do, and it's, eh, they don't really ever consider the audience, eh, when you do a five paragraph text, eh, you don't-- you don't necessary have to in order to get good marks on your exam, but when you, you get out there in the real life, you do. Eh, and also, you know, when it comes to the language when they speak, they don't actually address, eh, properly, eh, according to the circumstances they're in, or the situation they're in, so they would, you know, go straight forward and say can, can I have this, or...

**R:** Yeah, eh, and, and you for example, directly you, very typical Norwegian way of saying du [(you)].

**I:** Yes, yeah, so, so, they need to be more aware of it than they are and, and, you know, to be honest, wh-- when I'm working on, on a new, eh, new competence aims and, a new curriculum for, for all le-- all subjects, really, eh, and, one of the things that's new now is bringing back creative writing for instance, eh, and perhaps that will also open up to us being more aware of our teaching when it comes to, eh, the purpose of the writing, who's the audience, you know I used to do-- eh, are you familiar with RAFT? Role, audience, format, topic?

**R:** I'm not, actually.

**I:** No, it, it's sort of a... a, well, it, it, it's, eh, you ask your students to fill in what's, what's your role, what's the audience, eh, which format are you writing in, is it a letter to the au-- editor, or, say, you know, and then a topic with an active verb. And, lately, or, eh, at least in the last two years or three years I haven't done that with my students. So, [you know?] didn't feel, I don't know why, I'd just forgotten. And, and, we over focus on five paragraph texts.

Yeah, and, you know, yeah, so, so, definitely we need to become more aware of it, and also, become better, because we're not really that good, we sort of tend to do the same thing over and over again, eh, and that also makes it easier to, for our students at least, to plagiarise, yeah, because you know, [the post?] is already there so, but then... when you, when you mentioned, eh, this conversation, eh, and the topic, I didn't know-- I didn't look up the word, as I said, but I did stop to think of, you know, the language we use, also, is very classroom adapted. Eh, and we don't teach-- if our students are to travel, they don't know stuff, like, how to order, what's the different salads, for instance, basic things like that. But also more of, you know, eh, proverbs, and are familiar that good-- eh, that well with them. And, so, there's also a lot of work to be done there as well, not just about writing and, yeah, so, so, but... then again, you know, eh, the competence aims sort of, eh, sets a purpose for our teaching, but sometimes limit us as well, and sometimes we limit ourselves, I believe.

**R:** Yeah, maybe, that-- that could very well be the case. I suppose it, it depends on how you interpret the competence aims, and [unintelligible] very loose or very rigid, so... but I feel like the general tendency so far is that, eh, there's an idea that this is something we need to be something more aware of, but... again, with the competence aims, how do we sort of make this fit? Like, do we stuff it in explicitly, or do we sort of just let it float in the air around us, with, infused with everything else we do in the classroom, like... eh, I, I shouldn't say much more than that really, because I feel like I'm stepping on, [around?] the grounds of the question, so... eh, let's see, ok, I think... is there a problem with the sound, maybe?

[Recorder briefly paused to see whether it is still capturing the voices of R and I]

**R:** Right, so, eh, it's possible we've, we've kind of answered this already, but, eh, the next question is, what do you think of the current on teaching pragmatic competence? Is there a lack of focus, is there too great a focus in the, in the Norwegian classroom? Does it take, does it have a very small part or does it have a very big part?

**I:** Well, I would say, a, a very small part, really. Eh, and, and it depends a bit on the teacher, eh, but I think, eh, overall most teachers don't pay much attention to it, and, and they're not aware of it, eh, and also if they are, they tend to do specifically like, this lesson we're going to focus on... you know.

**R:** Today you're gonna learn how to be polite. (Laughter) Yes.

**I:** Yeah, eh, and start, eh, you know, start a conversation, end a conversation, you know. So, so that's how it's done, I believe, eh. And, I think it's part of the teaching culture [in one?] way as well. Eh, we're not that... well, on the other hand, I think they do it a bit in Norwegian, but I'm not familiar with that. I don't teach Norwegian, so, I wouldn't know.

**R:** No, me neither, actually. I-- I'm not sure. And it's been so many years since I actually, eh, since I was in a... upper secondary school myself, as, as a pupil, so I can't really remember how it worked then, either. So, eh, how do you teach your pupils to be pragmatically competent in the English language? Eh, you did mention that it's... probably not taught explicitly, it's not something we're very aware of. So, you did say some teachers might explicitly focus on during some classes, but is that something you do it, or is it...

**I:** Well, eh, no, so-- well, we talk about politeness [unintelligible] with the UK for instance, and the US, and, you know, similarities and differences, a bit, eh, compared to Norwegian, you know, sitting next to someone on the bus, stuff like that. Eh, but I also do conversations as, eh, as, eh, part of my teaching, eh, their-- that's part of their oral assessments, they do conversations. And one of the things we focus on then is to let other people into conversation, and obviously you won't do as well if you just blurt out everything you know about the topic and don't pay attention to the rest of the group. Because they'll be in groups of three to four pupils depending on, you know, the class size. And, and, I think that's it, really.

**R:** Yeah. (Laughter) Yeah, but that's, that's feels like that's the, that-- that's just how it is currently. [Unintelligible] The current situation is that it's sort of... it's there, but it's not explicit, and it may enter the scene sometimes when, in relation to what you're doing in the classroom. Because I feel like some of the topics you discuss, eh, in VG1 [(first year of upper secondary school)] with the UK and such, well it is kind of there, because you are learning about the culture, and, and when you-- perhaps you see a film in one class and so forth, they get some sort of idea of what it's about, but, eh, it's still not explicit. There might be some awareness of it [unintelligible]. And, eh, this might be a very difficult question. Do you have a rough estimate on how much time you spend per week, month or year teaching pragmatic competence, and... we have already answered that, haven't we? Yeah? (Laughter)

**I:** Yeah, yeah, it's barely... nothing. Eh...

**R:** But, but then, do you have any final or concluding thoughts? Your own attitudes towards pragmatic competence...



**I:** Well, having... you know, having talked about it now, I feel that, eh, we really should focus more on it, and be more aware, and also, I think that would also, eh, take the focus a bit away on how we're teaching English today. Eh, because, obviously, eh, English is, as a language, is really important. But it's also important to focus on how to address different people. Eh, this could be one of those things that we could think of in all subjects, really, because when you... eh, we, we learn about different cultures, different subjects, and, you know, how to approach different cultures, and... that could definitely be more focused on, not only in English, but in other subjects as well. Eh, and we also need to make our students... more-- better prepared, eh, for real life situations, eh, as well. You know, starting in a new company, how to behave, sort of, eh, what to do, not to do, what to say, not to do, different circumstances, different situations, and... we don't really do that, eh...

**R:** So, w-- English is definitely entering the Norwegian work place as well, it's being used broadly in, in, for example, in the private sector if you're going to work there. And, and I definitely agree that it is... perhaps necessary to, to make Norwegian pupils more aware of it, then teach it. But a question then is how, how do you teach this? But, eh...

**I:** And, and then, you know, you, you enter sort of, [a?] discussion of, this is the only-- English is a second language, and, you know, we, we still have Norwegian culture, we, we do the same things in Norwegian as we do in English, that's just the way we behave. Eh, but there are some areas we can improve, definitely. But, I wouldn't, I d-- I don't want my, my students to become, you know, British, or... you know, that's not my goal.

**R:** A second personality to develop, when you learn a second language. Eh, yeah.

**I:** Yeah, so, so, it's still, you know, it's... it's, it's the second language most, or... a, well, our foreign language [example?], yeah.

[Interview is concluded]

## Appendix C7: Interview 7 transcription

Key:

R = researcher, I = interviewee, [( )] = translation, [ ?] = interpretation, ( ) = reaction, [ ] = edit, -- = signals self-correction during speech, eh = signals sound made during speech, ... = signals pause made during speech

**R:** Så, første spørsmål. Hva er dine umiddelbare tanker når du hører begrepet pragmatisk kompetanse?

**I:** Da tenker jeg pragmatisk... med ordet pragmatisk så tenker jeg egentlig litt sånn praktisk, og nå er det klart at nå er jeg kanskje litt styrt av at, eh, elevene har fått noen spørsmål og de var jo knyttet til hvordan de skal henvende seg til folk på gata... også tenker jeg og kanskje... pragmatisk, eh, sånn som jeg sa nå nettopp før vi begynte å snakke her, eh, så, så, så var det litt det der med at jeg var litt nervøs for om elevene mine har husket å ta med please også videre, så det kan jo og knyttes til hvordan man, når man kommer til et annet land, at man kjenner til sosiale koder også videre. Og når man skal komme seg fram, og, og bli møtt. Vi har nettopp sittet i timen og sett faktisk et, et program, et program, som heter fotball, hva heter det for noe, nå husker jeg ikke... med Bård Tufte Johansen, som, eh, besøker Skotland, besøker fotballbar også videre. Celtic and Rangers. Og da det er det den der med at han stiller noen spørsmål, altså han, jeg merker det at han ikke kommer fra, fra England. At han er en litt sånn rett på?

**R:** Han blir avslørt? Ja, er, er han veldig direkte, er det det?

**I:** Ja det var et eller annet, du kan kanskje se det senere selv. Det var et eller annet med måten han snakke, han sa taxi driver... han satt i taxi, det var et eller annet sånn taxi driver, det var eller annet der. Ja. Så både litt på sosial kompetanse, hvordan man skal oppføre seg når man er i utlandet.

**R:** Ja. Litt sånn med tilpasning og, og den slags å gjøre, kanskje? Ja? Ja, det syntes jeg i grunn var godt svart.

**I:** Ja, det var godt.

**R:** Det... og. Og med tanke på den, den, la oss si da den definisjonen da, enkelt sagt, som du, som du har der, hvordan anser du da-- anser du da for å være relevant for norske elever å besitte denne typen kompetanse eller er det litt sånn mindre viktig?

**I:** Jo, det er kjempeviktig.

**R:** Eh, hva er ditt syn på det?

**I:** Eh, jo, det er selvfølgelig viktig, men, jeg, som jeg og nevnte for deg tidligere så, så hos meg så har, så har jeg lært mest engelsk gjennom å se filmere og litteratur også videre, sant? Men du lærer jo en del der og om hvordan du skal oppføre deg? Og det er klart at det, at det er kjempeviktig kompetanse for elevene å ha. Også hvis vi leser i avisen og i forbindelse med forskjellige typer, eh, bedrifter som ansetter, altså, jeg tenker at for elevene så er det ganske viktig å, å vite hvordan de skal oppføre seg, at det ikke bare er ord, men og hva man sier.

**R:** Ja, ja ikke sant? Ikke minst, det er ikke bare, med, med det grammatiske som skal være på plass, det er litt mer enn det. Okei, så er det... hva, hva tenker du om det, på en måte, det nåværende fokuset da på pragmatisk kompetanse i, i norske engelskklasserom? Er det...

**I:** I mitt engelske klasserom så er det kanskje ikke fokus nok på det...

**R:** Nei?

**I:** Men... jeg er jo litt nysgjerrig på hvordan din definisjon av pragmatisk kompetanse er? Fordi at det kan hende at jeg beveger meg litt utfor, for tenker det at hvis pragmatisk kompetanse har med det der kulturelle å gjøre-- så, når vi sitter og ser Fotballkrigen er det vel det heter det programmet vi sitter og ser akkurat nå, og da er det jo noe med det der at elevene ser at det skal se at det er lenker mellom det som foregår faktisk på fotballbanen og de er idrettselever og har kanskje en interesse av det, men at det ikke bare er fotball vet du, det symboliserer noe mer? Det kan være en sånn kunnskap som man rett og slett må skaffe seg.

**R:** Den, på en måte, den definisjonen, en veldig enkel definisjon på pragmatisk kompetanse er rett og slett-- du har nesten sagt det, eh, det går på, eh, bruk av språk på en fleksibel måte tilpasset konteksten du er i, og på en måte hensikten, det du vil frem til. Så du har på en måte en sånn sosiokulturell bit, med at du forstår at i denne settingen med disse menneskene må jeg spørre på den måten for ikke å grovt fornærme noen, også vet jeg at jeg må bruke disse ordene for å bli forstått da. Så du har på en måte the illocutionary and sociolinguistic-- de to delene lappes sammen til det da, men det syntes jeg jo lignet veldig det du sa innledningsvis med tilpasning til konteksten. Absolutt. Men fokuset det, det er kanskje litt, litt fraværende?

**I:** Hvertfall kanskje sånn eksplisitt, jeg tenker at det, jeg tenker at det... eh, når vi jobber med filmer og, og, og tekster også videre nå, så, så er det jo og, altså, der er jo et fokus på det kulturelle, på, på konteksten og, ikke sant? Så det at det, men jeg tenker det sånn eksplisitt, at

man, man sier til elevene for eksempel hvordan de skal snakke, skal henvende seg... det er det kanskje ikke nok om?

**R:** Dere begynner ikke timen med, elever, i dag skal vi lære hvordan dere er høflig på, på britisk vis, eller altså, nei, det er ikke sånn man går frem.

**I:** Det gjør ikke jeg i hvert fall. (Latter)

**R:** Nei, riktig. Da har vi så vidt tråkket på neste spørsmål. Det er, hvordan lærer du dine elever å være pragmatisk kompetente i engelsk? Altså dere ser jo film, og på en måte da får sånn kulturelle inntrykk.

**I:** Absolutt, og leser tekster.

**R:** Lese tekster ja, ja, er det noen andre måter?

**I:** Og der er det jo og et problem i forhold til, som jeg har nevnt, i forhold til... jeg har blitt intervjuet i forbindelse med hvilke tekster vi leser og litteratur også videre, og da er det jo og kjempeviktig at man får en oppdatert... oppdaterte tekster, og at vi får muligheten til å kjøpe nye.

**R:** De som er sånn relevant ja?

**I:** Ja, ikke sant? Jeg har lest, Jeg fikk nettopp en liten påminnelse av en tidligere elev at han hadde faktisk ikke lest of Mice and Men, han fikk firer av meg! Jeg måtte bare vite, jeg måtte bare vite at det fantes veldig mye stoff på...

**R:** På, på nett ja?

**I:** Ja, på nett. Jeg hadde jo en mistanke om det og. Nei, men det er noe med det der at du må ha tekster og da som, som gjør elevene i stand til å, å lære seg en del av disse kodene da, tenker jeg?

**R:** Ja, absolutt. Definitivt. Ja, det er, men så er det kanskje litt vanskelig å holde seg oppdatert hele tiden, fordi det er jo litt kjekt å jobbe med tekster som kanskje man har blitt litt vant til og?

**I:** Jada, absolutt, men jeg tror det er lurt, men jeg tenker, når du jobber som lærer, så det er det jo ikke sånn at du... selv om du gjerne, jeg syntes faktisk det er ganske herlig å ha en tekstbok, lærebok. Så da jobber jeg jo med en del av det samme, men så det er det jo det at du må, du utvider jo, du finner jo nytt hele tiden. Nå har vi fått et nytt bibliotek her inne, eller vi

har flyttet inn i nye lokaler og prøver å skaffe oss en del nye bøker og tekster også videre, og det syntes jo jeg er utrolig viktig i den, i den sammenhengen. Også er det en annen måte å gjort det på, holdt jeg på å si, det måtte jo være at man får praktisk reist av gårde til utlandet med elevene sine. Der er det jo noen rammer i forhold til skolen som...

**R:** Ja, det, det, noen elever får jo det med det tredjeåret? Enkelte steder i hvert fall så arrangeres det.

**I:** Ja, at de får lov å reise ja. Men det er ikke så, for meg som jobber med førsteklasinger så blir ikke det så aktuelt. Men det er klart at det tror jeg hadde vært utrolig lærerikt. Og når de får eventuelt bo hos-- nå snakket jeg nettopp med noen som har vært i Tyskland med elever. De får bo i, hos familier der og... og lære.

**R:** De tvinges i det, da må du bruke språk. Altså, da har du ikke noe valg. Det, det tror jeg absolutt er veldig lærerikt.

**I:** Også merker du, merker når du kanskje og hvis at du bryter disse kodene eller...

**R:** Ja, uffamei, det kan vel skje noen skikkelig kinkige episoder på grunn av det ja. Jeg tenker på egne turer jeg har vært på og, og jeg er på ingen måte noen ekspert. Eh, Så, så det, en lærer så lenge en lever.

**I:** Jeg ser jo bare det, jeg var i USA, jeg syntes jo det var fryktelig sliten med den der... how are you? Også finne det rette svaret?

**R:** Også kan det virke så, så fryktelig overdrevet vet du, vi nordmenn er ikke vant til den der...

**I:** Men hvis man ikke gjør det så virker vi frekke.

**R:** Frekke ja. Så, men da, neste spørsmål var egentlig da, har du noen sånn omtrentlig idé hvor, hvor mye tid du bruker i uka, året på pragmatisk kompetanse og i-og-med at ikke det ligger sånn eksplisitt planlagt, dette her gjør vi i dag, så er det kanskje vanskelig å svare på helt konkret?

**I:** Jeg synes og at det, hvis at det, jeg syntes og at kanskje det da burde, det som vi snakket bare som vidt om det mens elevene hadde undersøkelsen, da de gjennomførte undersøkelsen... at det... at revisjon av læreplanen. Og, og hvis det på en måte, det står jo ikke noe eksplisitt om det... det står at de skal lære seg... ikke sant?

**R:** Interkulturell forståelse, at det er viktigere, og det, absolutt, og det... Vi kan jo være litt smidige med de kompetanse og sånn og det som dukker opp i en læreplan, og da er det jo mulig å tolke det dithen at da er jo dette her en viktig del av det.

**I:** Viktig. Ja, ja, ja.

**R:** Så det gir jo noen føringer som en kan følge da.

**I:** Absolutt.

**R:** Ja, eh, så skal si vi se... nå står vi på snaut ni-og-et-halvt minutt, da tenker jeg, er det noe, er det noe siste tanker eller konklusjoner, noe... omkring dette med pragmatisk kompetanse?

**I:** Nei, jeg har ikke noe fornuftig å si.

**R:** (Latter) Jeg syntes du har hatt veldig mye fornuftig å si.

**I:** Nei, men jeg... det blir spennende å høre hva du kommer frem til og får... men jeg, jeg... akkurat nå så er det temmelig tomt.

**R:** Ja, men oppsummert?

**I:** Nei, nei jeg tenkte sånn, at pragmatisk kompetanse... eh, men det ligger vel kanskje sånn som jeg tenker på i forhold til... nå blir det mye mer snakk om at fagene skal måtte tenke mer tverrfaglig. Eh, og som norsklærer så opplever, tenker jeg og i forhold til det der begrepet neger ikke sant? Også det der med... med det der å ha den der... det er jo ikke så veldig mange som fremdeles går rundt og sier «neger» (latter), men jeg tenker det blir jo et eksempel på en måte på, på, på det der med sosiale koder, at man kjenner litt av bakgrunnen også videre, og kontekst i forhold til...

**R:** Også dette her med sånn, ja altså en sånn, nesten sånn... du blir litt sensitiv til det eller du kan føle litt da, hva som sømmer seg?

**I:** Mhm.

[Interview is concluded]

## **Interview 7: Translated to English**

**R:** So, first question. What are your immediate thoughts when you hear the term pragmatic competence?

**I:** Then I think pragmatics... with the word pragmatics, I think sort of, practically, and it's clear that I might be a bit influenced by that, eh, the pupils have received some questions and they were connected to how they should behave towards people in the street... and I think also, maybe... pragmatic, eh, like I said before we began talking here, eh, so, so, so, it had something to do with me being a little nervous whether my pupils had remembered to write please and so on, so it can also be connected to how one, when one comes to another country, that one knows social codes and so on. And to move forward, and, and, to be met. We have just sat in class and watched a, a programme, a programme, that's called football, what is the name of it, now I don't remember... with Bård Tufte Johansen, who, eh, visits Scotland, visits a football pub and so on. Celtic and Rangers. And then he asks a few questions, in order words he, I notice he's not from, from England. He is a little direct?

**R:** He's exposed? Yes, is, is he very direct, is that it?

**I:** Yes, there was something or the other, you can perhaps see it later yourself. There was something or the other about the way he spoke, he said taxi driver... he was in a taxi, it was something or the other, like, taxi driver, there was something or the other there. Yes. So both a little about social competence, how to behave when visiting another country.

**R:** Yes. A little about adaptation and, and that type of thing, perhaps? Yes? Yes, I think that's a good answer. That... and, and thinking on that, that, let's say, definition, simply, that you, that you have there, how do you consider-- do you consider it relevant for Norwegian pupils to possess this type of competence or is it less important?

**I:** Yes, it is very important.

**R:** What is your view on that?

**I:** Eh, yes, it is of course important, but, I, like I mentioned for you earlier, with me, I have learned most English through watching films and literature and so forth, right? But you learn how to behave from those? And it is clearly a very important competence for the pupils to possess. And if we read in the newspaper and in connection with different types, eh, of firms

who hire, then, I imagine that for the pupils it is quite important to, to know how to behave, that it's not just words, but what one says.

**R:** Yes, yes, right? And also, it's not just the, the grammatical that needs to be in place, there's more than that. Okay, so it's... what, what are your thoughts on the current focus on pragmatic competence in, in Norwegian English classrooms? Is it...

**I:** In my classroom there might not be enough focus on it...

**R:** No?

**I:** But... I am a bit curious about your definition of pragmatic competence? Because I might be moving outside of it, because I think if pragmatic competence is concerned with culture-- so, when we're watching Fotballkrigen [(Football war)], that's the name of the programme we're watching, and then the pupils should see that there's a connection between what happens on the football field, and they are sports students and may have an interest in it, that it's not just football, maybe it symbolises something more? It could be the kind of knowledge one simply must acquire.

**R:** That, in a way, that definition, a very simple definition of pragmatic competence is simply-- you have almost said it, eh, it's about, use of language in a flexible way, adapted to the context you're in, and, in a way, your purpose, what you want to achieve. So you have in a way a sociocultural part, that you understand that in this setting with these people I need to ask in this way to avoid seriously insulting someone, but I also know I need to use these words to be understood. So you have, in a way, the illocutionary and sociolinguistic-- those two parts combine into one, but I think it's similar to what you said in the beginning with adaptation to the context. Absolutely. But the focus, that is perhaps a bit, a bit absent?

**I:** At least explicitly, I think that, I think that it... eh, when we work with films and, and texts now, then, it is, I mean, there is a focus on the cultural, on, on the context, right? So, but I think like, explicitly, that one, one, says to the pupils, for example, how they should speak, behave themselves... there is perhaps not enough about that?

**R:** You don't start the class with, pupils, today we are going to learn about how to be polite in, in a British way, or, no, that's not how you approach it.

**I:** I don't, at the very least. (Laughter)



**R:** No, right. We have sort of stepped on to the next question. That is, how do you teach your pupils to be pragmatically competent in English? You watch films, and in a way receive cultural impressions.

**I:** Absolutely, and read texts.

**R:** Read texts, yes, yes, any other ways?

**I:** And there's a problem in connection to, as I have mentioned, in connection to... I have been interviewed in connection to which texts we read and literature and so forth, and then it's important that you receive an updated... updated texts, and that we have the opportunity to purchase new ones.

**R:** Those that are relevant, yes?

**I:** Yes, online. I had a suspicion about that as well. No, but there is something about having texts that enable pupils to, to learn these codes, then, I think?

**R:** Yes, absolutely, definitely. Yes, it is, but it is perhaps a bit difficult to stay updated all the time, because it is comfortable to work with texts you are a little more used to, also?

**I:** Yes, absolutely, but I think it wise, but I think, when you work as a teacher, then it's not like you... even if you want, I think it's lovely to work with a textbook, a course book. So I will start with some of the same, but then you have to, you expand, you find new things all the time. We [try to acquire] new books and texts and so on, and I think it is important in connection to that. And there is another way to do it, if one practically travels to another country with one's pupils. But then there are a few boundaries in connection to the school that...

**R:** Yes, that, that, some pupils do that in their third year? At least in some schools.

**I:** Yes, that they are allowed to travel. But it's not so, for me working with first year pupils, it's not that relevant. But of course it would have been incredibly educational. And when they eventually get to stay with-- I just spoke with someone who had been in Germany with some pupils. They live with families there and... and learn.

**R:** They are forced into it, then they must use language. You don't have a choice. That, that I think is incredibly educational.

**I:** And you'll notice, perhaps, if you break any of these codes or...

**R:** Yes, some truly awkward situations may arise because of it, yes. I think of my own trips, and, and I'm in no way an expert. Eh, so, so, you learn for as long as you live.

**I:** I was just recently in the USA, and was exhausted by that... how are you? And then finding the right answer?

**R:** And it can seem so, so terribly excessive, you know, we Norwegians aren't used to that...

**I:** But if we don't do it, we come across as rude.

**R:** Rude, yes. So, but then, next question was actually, do you have some rough estimate on how much time you spend per week, year on pragmatic competence, and since it's not explicitly planned, this is what we'll do today, it might be difficult to answer with a concrete figure?

**I:** I also think that, perhaps, like we talked about while the pupils conducted their test, that a revision of the... course curriculum. And, and if that, in a way, there's nothing explicit in it about it... it says they are supposed to learn... right?

**R:** Intercultural understanding, that is more important, and it, absolutely, and it... we can be a bit flexible with competence and such, and that which shows up in the curriculum, and it's possible to interpret that it's an important part of it.

**I:** Important. Yes, yes, yes.

**R:** It gives some guidelines to follow. Yes, eh, so, shall we see... we've talked for roughly nine-and-a-half minutes, I think, is there something, any last thoughts or conclusions, anything about... pragmatic competence?

**I:** No, I don't have anything sensible to say.

**R:** (Laughter) I think you have spoken a lot of sense.

**I:** No, but I... it will be exciting to hear what you find out and... but I, I... right now it's quite empty.

**R:** Yes, but summarised?

**I:** No, but I think, that pragmatic competence... eh, but it's like a little like when I think about, in connection to... there's a lot of talk about the subjects having to be more interdisciplinary. Eh, and as a teacher of the Norwegian course, I think in connection to that term *negro*, right? And that about... to have that... there aren't that many who still walk

around saying negro (laughter), but I think that's an example, in a way, of social codes. You know the background, and so forth, and the context in connection to...

**R:** And that about, almost a, almost a... you are made a little sensitive to it, or you can feel it, what's appropriate?

**I:** Mhm.

[Interview is concluded]

## Appendix C8: Interview 8 transcription

Key:

R = researcher, I = interviewee, [( )] = translation, [ ?] = interpretation, ( ) = reaction, [ ] = edit, -- = signals self-correction during speech, eh = signals sound made during speech, ... = signals pause made during speech

**R:** My first question is, what are your immediate thoughts when you hear the term pragmatic competence?

**I:** Eh, well, it's a bit vague, but, eh, if, eh, I know the word pragmatism. It means, eh, seeking solutions and... going with the flow and trying to make the best out of things so I assume that it would mean... in English language teaching to, eh, to try and find about a problem, if you, if you're lost to words, you, you come up with an alternative solution, you, you think on your feet, and, yeah, those kinds of things, yeah, willingness to, willingness to talk in every situation even though you, you don't perhaps know what you're talking about (laughter). Or how to use the words. Just trying to sort of get around the issue in one way or another. Yeah.

**R:** Some, some sort of way to adapt to the situation. Yeah, definitely, I think that's a, a good way to, to at least in part describe what pragmatics is about. The use of language, eh, and the ability to adapt to the demands of the current situation. Eh, the one definition, very rough definition I've found is that it's, eh, which is very linked to what you said, eh, it says that pragmatic competence is the ability to use the language accurately and flexibly, eh, in different social contexts. So, you know, how to, for instance... ok? Looks like there's some issue with the sound...

[Recorder briefly paused to see whether it is still capturing the voices of R and I]

**R:** So, so the, eh, the ability to adapt to the current situation. And, for instance, I am going to ask this person for help, but we are not from the same country. Say, he's an Englishman and I'm Norwegian. How would I ask this person for help without offending him. I know how to do this in Norwegian, but I'm, I'm not entirely sure how I do it in English. So it's, it's these kinds of things. And then knowing this, what you said, and, and this very brief definition, what is your view on the relevance of pragmatic competence among, eh, English, eh, Norwegian EFL learners?

**I:** Eh... I'm not quite sure, I haven't thought much about it, but, eh... I think perhaps that they... might not be always aware of how to behave, eh, language wise, eh, I think, perhaps, they might... offend? Eh, perhaps, but perhaps it's more if they meet British people, British speaking people, or, eh, English speaking people than American speaking people, because, I think, many... or my opinion is, or observation is that many, eh, Norwegian teens they are very influenced by an American, eh, popular culture and very informal way of expressing oneself, so, eh, if they then encounter, eh, British person with stiff upper lip and they start going fuck and all those things, I think they're going to end up in a very awkward situation. So, I assume that they will offend, and, perhaps also... eh, the use of, eh, or the lack of the use of these auxiliaries like might, could, would, sort of, to sort of deflect certainty, I think perhaps, we, I don't think many Norwegian youths reflect on that at all.

**R:** I think many teachers would agree with you on that, that Norwegian pupils aren't very aware how to be polite in a correct way, especially when it comes to demands of-- in situations where you're talking to someone who is at least, eh, in England, a British person, seen as being above you when it comes to status and power. And that it's possible it still would address him as... you know, just anyone.

**I:** Yeah, yeah. But I think perhaps some... but, they, they, they are aware of the fact that in, in Britain, eh, politeness is more important than in Norway. Because we, yesterday we talked about what you associate with Britishness and then one person said that they're very polite, eh... to each other. So they are aware that something is going on (laughter). At least some of them.

**R:** Yes. But I think that awareness is as, as important, that it shows something. At least, they're, they're, they're on the right way to understanding that, well, maybe I need to... do something, make some steps to address this person correctly. Eh, and then what do you think of the current focus on pragmatic competence? For instance, is there a lack of focus or is there too great a focus? I think you, you've kind of mentioned it by saying, well, maybe it's not directly addressed.

**I:** Eh, well, eh, I don't think that we pay a lot of attention to it in this level, because it's the, eh, highest, it's the highest level of English in videregående, [(upper secondary school)] or upper secondary, and we focus a lot on, eh, history and politics and, eh, current debates, and, eh, socio-economic conditions in the US and the UK, so there isn't a lot of time for this. But I know that in the second year, they teach a course called international English and it's a lot

about, eh, English in a global context, and, eh, cultural, eh, or, or, eh, communication between cultures and mistakes you can make, so perhaps they touch on it there? But we don't really, we really don't have time... for it. The only thing we focus on, perhaps, in, in this respect would be, how to create a formal, eh, language, eh, when you write. Because they, th-- the tasks that they are given is, eh, sorry, are often related to write an article in which you discuss, eh, something, political system, or the political parties or the development of, eh, historical incident. And then, the requirements in the written exam are very strict. You are supposed to be very formal, eh, advanced vocabulary, no contractions, eh, not a lot of me, me, me, me. And, I think, for some of them it's very hard to adopt this more formal writing persona and this advanced vocabulary, and also varied vocabulary, eh, which, which sort of signals a truly... eh... interesting and formal text. And, I think many Norwegian youths, they believe they are very good at English. But they aren't. They are mediocre. And they know how to-- they can talk about all kinds of things in a... sort of everyday sense, but they aren't able to discuss... eh, political issues or historical issues. They don't have the vocabulary for those, eh, kinds of... so that's what we're trying to make them, formal, and make them realise how little they know (laughter).

**R:** (Laughter) You know nothing. (Laughter) Yes, eh, what about then, for, for, perhaps thinking in particular about the VG1 [(first year of upper secondary school)] pupils, because not all of them will go on to taking the programme courses, or in-depth studies of English.

**I:** I can't... I can't say anything about the VG1 [(first year of upper secondary school)] cou— students, because I haven't taught the course for many years.

**R:** Yeah, okay, yeah, but wou-- would you then, would you then see it as for, for them, maybe, to address this issue at, at that level since there might...

**I:** I, yeah, I think so, yeah. Because that's the general English course that every Norwegian student has to go through. So, yeah, and... yeah, I think so.

**R:** Yeah. For, for some of them that will be the last year that they [unintelligible].

**I:** Yeah, so they should definitely touch on this. Because it's, I think it's, eh, (clears throat), eh, I think it's really rude, in a way, to, to... eh, you should try to learn that aspect of the language, because it's very rude to not... to behave in a sort of Norwegian way in English. Not saying please and not, sort of, being, eh, yeah, not bombastic and sort of, try to be... vague in a polite, polite sense, yeah.

**R:** Yeah, I, I spoke to a few pupils the other day, when, when handing out a survey to them, and, and I asked them on how would you address someone in Norwegian? And they said du [(you)]. Just pointing and saying du [(you)]. And, and doing that to an English person would probably... they'd cut off your finger or... yes.

**I:** Yeah, it's very rude, yeah. Yeah. But I also think, perhaps, that, eh, you know I was a bit, eh, negative towards, sort of, American informal language, but, eh, another aspect of American language use is this, how are you, and, sort of showing interest in the other person, which we don't... we don't do that. We just say hello or javel [(okay)] or something like that. But Americans they ask, yeah, how are you... and this... con-- types of conversations that we never carry out. So that could be an aspect of the American language use, yeah.

**R:** Absolutely, because, eh, there-- eh, a problem arises when an American asks a Norwegian, hi, how are you?

**I:** Yeah, and then you lalalalalala.

**R:** Yeah, yeah, and they will start telling everything about your, you know, family issues, and, and all those kinds of things when he just said hello. My next question is, how do you teach your pupils to be pragmatically competent in the English language. You-- you've said that you, you're practicing writing in formal prose. So that's one way of teaching...

**I:** Yeah, that would probably be it. And also, I... focus on, eh, variation in vocabulary and precision in vocabulary, I think, eh, but we don't talk a lot about please and those kinds of things. That's, eh, sort of not our cup of tea (laughter).

**R:** Not the main focus.

**I:** Yeah.

**R:** Eh, and then, this question is, is probably very difficult to answer. It's, do you have a rough estimate on how much time you spend per week, month or year teaching pragmatic competence, and, and, that would be a very rough guesstimate really, eh... it sounds like, eh, the pragmatic competence, it's kind of there, when you teach these formal aspects and precision with the language, it is... somewhat surrounding what you're doing. But it's not taught explicitly, but it still enters the classroom, so it's...

**I:** Yeah. Eh, I, I really can't answer the question, it's eh... but perhaps we could say that, for every topic that we... introduce, we try to bring in some kind of writing skills, eh, or some

kind of, eh, vocabulary, eh, yeah. And also, we, I think we... we talk about, when, if they give oral presentations... I try to give them feedback on, if they, you know, some people, they... they don't really, not exactly, they don't exactly swear, but they become very agitated or, you know, just to sort of, don't do this and... yeah. But we, I think we're, we're more on teaching them, eh, precision and content and those kinds of things to enhance, enhance the, eh, communication. We don't look all that much into, eh, sort of politeness and those kinds of things.

**R:** That could be a very important stepping stone. The accuracy and vocabulary, because you will... I think you will need some of these things to actually be able to, to formulate yourself in a precise and accurate way in different situations. Final question, what are your concluding thoughts, final or concluding thoughts. Anything about the teacher attitudes towards this subject or your own thoughts?

**I:** Eh... af-- I, my opinion is, perhaps, that this is a topic that they should deal with in lower secondary, perhaps, where they have, perhaps they can do this. And, because when they come-- or in the first year. The first year is probably, sort of, the final step to teach them this. And, for the two other courses, it's more, sort of as a... a bleak part of the subject. I, I, personally, I think that more students should go on with English, eh, in the second and the third year. Because... many students plan to study abroad. Eh, and if they are, if they are lost, if they end English in the first year, they have two years without formal training in English, and they come abroad and they... seem like... you know, children. Because they haven't really (clears throat) they haven't really worked on the language, and, eh, also the insights that they gain through these courses. Second year course with multiculturalism and, sort of, English around the globe and studying abroad and those kinds of things, and then this, this course that I teach with history and politics and... and, eh, American politics, also British politics, they, they are, they are everywhere around us, but, eh, many Norwegian youngsters they don't know anything. And that's one... I think that's one thing... that you can be a pragmatic language user through knowledge. And, you know, that they have these metaphors and these expressions and... and fake news and those kinds of things. And if they aren't informed about this, they can't take part in conversations, eh, about these topics. And they, and they can also sound very, very rude because they, they make comments based on, you know, Trump's, eh, stupid...

**R:** Tweets.



**I:** Yeah. (Laughter) So, eh, yeah. And I don't know if they, eh... if they sh-- and perhaps also they should learn something about that it's... isn't it considered a bit rude to discuss politics with people from another country, you, I mean, you don't really know what's going on there.

**R:** Yeah, you should, at least, demonstrate that you have a very good insight to the subject, I think.

**I:** Yeah, but I also-- but I, I read a very interesting book which is called Watching the English. And in this book they talk about the few things that you should never discuss with a British person (laughter). The money you make and the things... and you have the front garden, the front garden is on display, but the back garden is a private place and (laughter), it's a really nice book.

[Interview is concluded]

## Appendix C9: Interview 9 transcription

Key:

R = researcher, I = interviewee, [( )] = translation, [ ?] = interpretation, ( ) = reaction, [ ] = edit, -- = signals self-correction during speech, eh = signals sound made during speech, ... = signals pause made during speech

**R:** The first question is, what are your immediate thoughts when you hear the term pragmatic competence?

**I:** Eh, well, if we look at the word pragmatic, it's probably things that are useful. Eh, and with useful... well... when it comes to the English subject it's probably within... the English classroom... or the competences you need when you leave school, but still need to use English. But to be honest, I don't know the exact definition within the dida-- didactic definition.

**R:** I think you... that is a very good explanation of it, at least part of it, because it is concerned with actual use of language and language realisation. Language use to achieve... something specific, for example asking for help or... being aware of what's also not said. For instance, instance, you can, someone can walk into a room and say, well, it's stuffy in here, you know. That person could either say it's very warm, we need to let in some air, or it could just be, eh, an observation. So it's, eh, use of language to, for instance, eh, make a request. And it's also sensitivity to... and, and, the sensitivity to... what's not said. Eh... but yes, it's, it's absolutely, eh, what you said. That this is something that pupils might need when they leave school, something very concrete. So knowing this... your brief explanation of what pragmatic competence is, what is your view on the relevance of, of this competence among the Norwegian EFL pupils?

**I:** I'm sorry. Again, repeat the question? What is the...

**R:** Eh, what is your view on the relevance of pragmatic competence in English for your Norwegian pupils?

**I:** Eh... when it comes to relevance, well it... well, we read in news all the time that they will need English when they leave school, and... it comes to business related work. I don't know what my students will be doing after school, but I know for travel, they will have to be able to get around, eh, on their own, eh. They encounter English all the time, even when they don't

think about it, so... it's, it's highly relevant, but I can't think of specific situations where they will need it. Yeah.

**R:** I, I think that, eh, since they will be going travelling, eh, it could be very useful to, to know how to, eh, to... again when asking for help, do that in a way that doesn't offend the other person. So, eh, what we did talk about in-- what I did mention for your pupils in class, that when you ask for something in English, don't do it the same way you would do it in Norwegian, just say you, eh, for instance. Eh, but, but then what you think of the current focus on teaching pragmatic competence, for instance, is there a lack of focus?

**I:** Yeah

**R:** (Laughter) or is there too great a focus, but, eh...

**I:** I don't think there is a focus on pragmatic competence, well, I think, I think there is a focus on using English and using English all the time, eh... I... well, as you observed, I, I only use English in my classroom and my students are, eh... they, they're asked to use English, they're asked to answer in English, eh, I try to make they-- them comfortable... speaking English and practicing using their English. Eh, however, I don't... I don't correct them. Like, I don't tell them... eh, you could have asked in this, about this in a different way, you could have been more polite, or... eh. My focus is just, use your English, and then... that's the starting point. Of course if, if it's a... if we're talking about a specific topic, then I might want to... to try to correct them and tell them that, if you had done this it would've seemed more academic or more polite or more professional. We sometimes do, eh, job interviews... they have write their own CV and... find a job they would like to apply for online, and then be... do roleplay where they have to ask... well... they, they have to apply for a job, pretend to apply for a job, and then we do job interviews in the classroom. That's typical situation where I'll probably... eh, guide them... in theories of English. I don't know if I answered your question, I'm thinking of my, eh... (laughter).

**R:** I think you did, I think you did (laughter). And, you did say that, they do encounter, or, or, what I assume, they do encounter different tasks. They have to learn to write different types of English, for instance prose, and so forth.

**I:** And speak.

**R:** And speak. So they learn... different kinds of specific [language?] use. So, there's some...

**I:** Informal, formal, yeah, and different situations, and...

**R:** Yeah. So that, act-- just a fun fact, that I've read a few, eh, I've read one master thesis written earlier, and that was about e-mails to professors by Norwegian students. An—and I was... almost shocked to see what some of them wrote, how casually they greeted them, and that was just, you know, when we're talking about specific use of language, and learning how to write, for instance, a formal letter and so forth. There was just a complete lack of that knowledge, and that was amusing to see. So, I think that... these tasks the pupils encounter, or, it sounds to me like some of these tasks they encounter when-- job interview, formal letters, and all that, that might help them.

**I:** Hopefully. Yeah. Try to think about... well, how they use they use their English and what's suitable for the different situations. We also do the other way and, and make... roleplay of very informal situations where they're supposed to use slang and... eh, and... casual language to... yeah. So, it's difficult, because you have... situations in the classroom that are not real life situations, but you want them to use as much English as possible. So... you have to... make up situations, but they work.

**R:** Yeah. They're not... authentic, but they, they, they're somewhat similar anyway. So, eh, when it comes to the focus there's not, do you think, a, a, too great a focus, there is...

**I:** Well, not... eh, no... not in the way that... we always before we, when we plan a class, I, me and my colleague, we... we plan all the classes together. Eh, we always say, they have to read, write, listen, speak, eh, through, for instance, two times forty five minutes. They have to do all this. But, eh, we never say... we never discuss the pragmatic use of English. That's not... a term we use when we plan. We might discuss competence aims and formal, informal language, but not pragmatic, no.

**R:** Do you... eh, have you spotted any, when you talk about the competence aims, do you see something that could kind of... relate to pragmatic competence, something that looks similar, or?

**I:** Well, it's the one where the students have to... eh... write different kinds of texts and, yeah, make use of English in different ways, probably.

**R:** Yeah, yeah. There could be some... some things one could recognise, but not pragmatic competence specifically.

**I:** No, not with that term, no.

**R:** The next question is, how do you teach your pupils to be, how, how to be pragmatically competent in the English language. Do you explicitly focus on it in some classes, or is it something you do not actively teach? You... briefly touched upon this by saying that there is not a real explicit focus on it.

**I:** No. It's not an explicit focus on it. Absolutely not. We... practice using English in general, but not... being polite.

**R:** You don't start the class saying, toadying we're gonna have... talk about pragmatic competence, and you're gonna learn how to be pragmatic... no, ok. Exactly.

**I:** No. Absolutely not. No. No. We start the class saying, today we're going to, eh, focus on writing our own CV and then, yeah. (Laughter)

**R:** Yeah, but, eh, so then the next question is, do you have a rough estimate on how much time you spend teaching pragmatic competence? And again, since it's not explicit, this will be very difficult to measure.

**I:** Yeah, I can't measure it. It could be from, from, from none to half of it. It's, eh... I have no idea. (Laughter)

**R:** Then, eh, then I think we, we've, eh... I think it's ok to move on to the final question, that is, what are your final or concluding thoughts? That can be anything about your own attitudes towards this type of competence, or...

**I:** Well, it would be interesting to know more about pragmatic competence. Perhaps, eh... knowing how to incorporate it in how we already work. Eh, or say, if there's a method that we can include, for instance if we... when we work on a given topic, we could... probably have included pragmatic competence, but we haven't thought of it because it hasn't been... eh, a focus.

**R:** Yeah. So it could be implemented into something already existing. Yeah.

**I:** Probably. Absolutely. Yeah. So that's my thoughts. I always want to try to improve the English lessons, and if that's something that they could make use of, which it sounds like they... absolutely could, then... it would be interesting to... to focus more on it.

[Interview is concluded]

## Appendix C10: Interview 10 transcription

Key:

R = researcher, I = interviewee, [( )] = translation, [ ? ] = interpretation, ( ) = reaction, [ ] = edit, -- = signals self-correction during speech, eh = signals sound made during speech, ... = signals pause made during speech

**R:** What are your immediate thoughts when you hear the term pragmatic competence?

**I:** Pragmatic competence is a word that... I'm not too familiar with, to be honest with you. It is a top-- topic that I had to investigate a little bit, because I have... it's been a while since I was a student (laughter). Eh, so, eh, so it was kind of confusing. But when I read through the questions and what it is that you talked-- that you wanted to talk about, it basically dawned on me, eh... that... what it was about, and I was kind of happy to realise that this is actually something that I do (laughter) without knowing it, in many ways, that I'm very concerned about in my teaching.

**R:** Maybe that's the, the problem is the unfamiliarity with the word. You are, you, you know what it is, [unintelligible] have experienced it, but, but you lack the, you know... you haven't used the term before in, yeah. So, eh, so, so you said, it's something you've experience with, but, but, eh... what then, h-- do you think it's relevant for your pupils... learning English?

**I:** It's very... it is very relevant, because, in a way, when they are in my class, eh, they step into a different type of culture. And this is essential to basically be part of any culture, to be aware of the things that they say and do. In Norwegian, the things that they feel is, eh, appropriate to say, eh, here, is not, abroad. And, eh, they may, they find themselves in situations where they, without knowing it, you know, like, offend someone. You know. And to make them aware of these things, and having lived abroad myself, obviously, I became aware of these things. Eh, and living with [an immigrant] makes me aware of it every day. You know. Eh, and, eh, and then I can pass that knowledge on to the pupils, so that, eh, it's not just about learning English, it's about using the language and... you know, getting ab-- getting by. You know. Eh, in a setting where they might find themselves being excluded because they speak in a certain way. Eh, to make them aware that this is why they reacted to, to you. And I tell them stories about, eh, you know, professors that shared their personal stories about, eh, speaking English that, eh, they think they speak correctly, and obviously, then all of a sudden someone reacts. And I tell them of funny situations, eh, where the

language itself, eh, even if you speak English in one country, eh, the same word can mean something totally different (laughter) in a different country. You know.

**R:** Yeah. That's the, also the thing, is the... eh... the situation that may arise because the pupils are not aware [of?], at the same time, what's not being said. Eh, because I've felt... being in England, they can say one thing, but there's something else there that they're not saying. And, and so that they maybe they, they need to become aware of also the-- these hidden meanings. These things which are just... eh... part of the way we talk to each other. You're not aware of unless, as you say, you've been to the country and you live with [an immigrant] so you become aware of these things, obviously, but the pupils won't.

**I:** Yes, and then I can tell them funny stories about misunderstandings that may arise from it, so...

**R:** Exactly. O-- one, one example is of course the, the American who says, hi, how are you? And the Norwegian thinks, eh, nice, he's concerned about my well-being, I'll tell him everything that's happened over the weekend, whereas the American just wanted to say hi, really.

**I:** Exactly. So... and it makes us a little bit uncomfortable. Because, you meet a stranger who says those things to you. And you're like... okay? Eh, and we don't... because this is something that we wouldn't do. We would say, you know, a simple hello, you know. Eh, how-- you know, we would say, how are you to a friend, you know. And these things. It's very peculiar to experience.

**R:** It is. What do you think of the current focus, then, of teaching pragmatic competence in, in the classroom? Do you feel there is, eh, too much of a focus? Is there no focus really at all, or?

**I:** I think there is focus on it. Because, obviously, my pupils have noticed and picked up on it. Eh, but I feel that... that... the, the, things that you learn, eh... may not correspond to what you actually experience. Because, like I say, we say things, you know, that you have to be polite, but... we have students who go to the UK, eh, from this class, some of them have been selected and they will go to the UK next year. And they might experience that, they weren't as, as, you know, as, eh, polite as what you told us. Eh, because, and like I've said, you know, that will be different as well. So, I can say to them that you will meet people who are casual, eh, and young people will not say, may I go and, you know, because they will be, you know,

more or less the same, as, as they will be. Eh, so, in a way, I always encourage people to pay attention to when they go abroad... see... what they can learn just from the time, but obviously encourage them to speak to someone from that country, eh, so that they can get some ideas, eh, to, to, eh, to, to, to do that, so, we do speak English, and I think that in most classes, I'm not sure... I remember when I went to school that we spoke English, but we read texts and such, eh, but you don't really get to experience what it's like, eh, before you actually go there. To live. Eh.

**R:** So, so the authentic situations, they really...

**I:** Yeah, because you know, like, because we get the idea that we have to be very polite when we go to the UK, or to the United States, eh, but when you actually go there, you realise that, in many ways, you can be yourself. You just have to... you know, be aware of certain things (laughter) that we do... eh, that can, can, can be... you know... eh. Because, basically, you know, like, it's about speaking. So, I, I, I put a lot of effort into, eh, asking them to speak English, because that's the practice that they get. Eh, and then they can... basically play different roles and they can, eh, be whoever they want to be in that... eh, but that is difficult to get the pupils along, because they feel a little bit embarrassed about speaking English to another Norwegian.

**R:** Yeah. I can imagine. (Laughter) Eh, how do you teach your pupils to be pragmatically competent in the English language. You've said already you want them to speak as much as possible, and they play roles, so, these are two things that you...

**I:** Yes. And I also make them aware, eh, because we do have classes on the differences between, you know, formal English and informal English. Eh, and that they, eh, really should become aware of when they use one language, and, and, not the other. Eh, and that, certain things, like I said, certain things that we do, giving them examples, eh, in my, you know, every-- like, the experiences that I've had, eh, and experiences that other-- others have had. And we share the stories and then, obviously, we try to, eh, I try to make them aware. So like, say, if they say, hey you, they say-- then I will correct them. You know, eh, if they say hæ? [(what?)] I will say things like that. If they speak Norwegian, I will say, I hear a language that I don't understand, making them aware of, of this. Some people are, you know, very... eh, timid about speaking English. So, then I take them out... of the classes, and then we can have a conversation, eh... you know, together. And I find that speaking English to them makes them speak English to me. And that way they get to use the language, and then, obviously, eh,



you know, and when they feel confident-- I know it's a learning process, you know, learning how to say pardon is a learning process because we have grown up being allowed to say hæ [(what)] all the time. Hæ [(what)] is not, you know, something that is rude here. It's annoying if they say hæ [(what)] like many times, but it's not rude. But whereas when you get to the United Kingdom, you might, you may-- you may not experience, but you might experience people reacting negatively to it, and very, eh, be very clear about it, that this is not okay. You know. And to copy. Eh, and then just, basically, and then the entire situation turns nasty. But others might not react to it. You know. And those are my experiences that... eh, but now that I've lived there (laughter). Hæ [(what)]. I just don't use it anymore. I use it here, but I don't use it there.

**R:** Yeah. Eh, do you have a, a rough estimate then on how much time you spend per week, month or year teaching this. And I realise this might be a very tricky question. Because it's...

**I:** I think it's part of my everyday lesson. It's just a part of...

**R:** It, it sounds like it gets [weaved?] into the things you do, the conversations, and when you correct their utterances such as hæ [(what)] and so forth.

**I:** Exactly. And also... that... like I start my lessons by asking them politely to take, you know, to close their computers. And then they hear. So when they hear, eh, my idea is that throughout the year, they might, you know, do something about it, or... eh, or be more aware of it. And I, I do know that they are. Because we just had a test on this (laughter). For the te-- for the midterm last week. They were to correct an informal letter, you know, and give advice to a friend about how to improve it. And, eh, they had a lot of knowledge, you know, they said, you know, don't use exclamation marks in a formal letter. So they do have, eh, the knowledge, they could also use it, you know, to explain to their friend that this letter was not written in a proper way. Eh, that they would not be listened if they did this. So, to me that show, that they are very much aware of it, and that they have learned... eh, and they could actually pick examples from the text, and use these to explain. Which was very good.

**R:** Yeah. Do they also manage to distinguish between, eh, writing a formal letter in, in Norwegian, compared to English, for instance.

**I:** Yes. Eh, they, I lea-- I teach them, you know, certain, eh, sim-- like, for instance, we don't tend to start the letters with dear. (Laughter) You know, we just tend to... just start, you know, what the letter is in reference of, you know, very impersonal, whereas they have a more

personal, formal approach, in a way, by saying dear or yours sincerely, you know, those things. Eh, whereas our way of writing is very detached. Eh, very impersonal.

**R:** Very straight to the point.

**I:** Yeah, very straight to the point.

**R:** What are your final or concluding thoughts? Be it your, eh, attitude towards pragmatic competence, what you've observed in the classroom, anything, really.

**I:** My final thoughts is that, I would like-- I, I would like to say that they learn something. I know that they have learned something because they show that to me that they are aware of it and they have been aware of it as well, before they even came to my classes. Eh, I don't think I have succeeded in removing hæ [(what)] and the Norwegian arm, and the pointing and saying, hey, you, eh, but, I made them aware of it. So that when they do travel to a different country, eh, these are the things they will think about. You know, so, eh, and to, like I said, I'm very open about the fact that we can teach them certain things, but then they might experience the opposite of what we tell them. Eh, but that's life, you know, that's way of the culture, how culture works, eh, and... but I think it's important to make them aware of it, because, eh... I've experienced to people reacting to hæ [(what)] and the arm. My [betrothed] reacts to the arm. And I'm like, oh, sorry. (Laughter) It's just that I don't want to inconvenience anybody, you know, and this is the way that we do it. My parents did it, you know, and, and... eh, so. Yeah. So, it's difficult to get rid of. But at the same time, it's important that people feel... they can be themselves. So, when I go to the United Kingdom, I know that certain situations, I find, you know, like... eh, nerve wrecking. Especially when I meet people I don't know. I see my [betrothed who] just, just does it, you know, eh, automatically. You know, mister Brown, yes, it just feels so weird to say mister Brown. Eh, so, I just try to avoid the whole situation. I just say, oh, pleased to meet you, and... my name is... and, you know, and, eh, yeah. But in most cases, you know, being yourself works. Works quite well.

[Interview is concluded]