Pragmatic Competences in Oral Textbook Tasks

Mulyanto
Universitas Dr. Soetomo
Surabaya City, Indonesia
mastermully@yahoo.co.id

Sudarwati
Universitas 17 Agustus 1945
Surabaya City, Indonesia
sudarwatitunah@gmail.com

Abstract—Even though language users can use English in a grammatically correct way, this does not mean that it has to suit the communication situation. Communication will always be part of the bigger picture and social context. In order to be able to assess the environment with participants, the sociocultural context and purpose of communication before someone speaks is important in order to participate in successful communication. This is an important part of pragmatic competence. Like other language skills, students need guidance in acquiring them as well as types of competencies. The school library has the opportunity to contribute to this development process.

The aim of this study is to map how oral assignments in three textbooks for common English subjects contain the possibility to develop pragmatic competences. I have seen how many times the difference between the sub-components of pragmatic competence is needed. I have also researched the type, amount, and location of met pragmatic information that is disseminated to students in this assignment.

This study is based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (2001). Pragmatic competence presentation. The work has laid the foundation for quantitative analysis. Using the criteria developed for pragmatic competence and oral assignments, textbook analysis was carried out, with text analysis as part of the method. The three textbooks are, Access to English New Experience.

Oral skills are listed as one of the five basic skills in The Knowledge Promise (2013). These skills are perhaps the most important when considering what skills most students will use in their lifetime. Pragmatic competence accounts for one-third of how the supervisory framework understands communicative competence. However, it may take some time before research can be made of teaching material. This study shows that pragmatic competence has become part of the curriculum and textbooks. There is still room for improvement.

I. INTRODUCTION

As a result of globalization, English has entered several areas of everyday life. Being able to master the language is often needed in college, when gathering information and when traveling. In different communication situations the user faces various contextual factors to which language must be adjusted in order to successfully cross. It is knowledge about how meaning depends on the context and how to use appropriate language, that is what constitutes pragmatic competence. My interest lies in how textbooks deal with the pragmatic

development of competence. The purpose of this study is to map the aspects of pragmatic competence across tasks of oral textbooks for the 1st semester of the extensive reading (hereinafter referred to as Exr.1).

Most people have heard funny stories about faulty communication due to a misunderstanding between foreigners and native English speakers. Such situations can, however, also have negative consequences. Your interlocutor can end up feeling embarrassed, or even worse, considered rude. Knowledge of what types of language are suitable for different language situations and how context affects the meaning of language reduces the frequency of misunderstandings that occur. As such competences are recognized as pragmatic competences . The importance of learners having and being able to use such knowledge is raised in official documents such as the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching and Assessment.

It can be said that the term pragmatic, confusing and incomprehensible to many people. Personally, I have experienced very few people who have managed to explain the word. In relation to the field of language teaching, several attempts have been made to define pragmatics and pragmatic competences. According to Crawford, J. (2002):

Pragmatic competence is related to the user's / student's knowledge of principles according to the message:

a) organized, structured and regulated ('discourse competence');

b) is used to perform a communicative function ('functional competence');

c) sorted according to the interactional and transactional schemes ('competency design'). (p. 123)

Pragmatic competence allows students to consider contextual factors and choose the right language for successful communication. If pragmatically competent, learners know which languages are suitable for different situations. They can also draw on the repertoire of language functions to remove ambiguity, and are familiar with what changes and patterns of verbal exchange include in different situations.

The importance of a focus on spoken language is highlighted in Threshold Level (1991), which presents the essential communicative needs and forms of language that learners need to pass the threshold of success in everyday situations where English is needed. Not all language users will practice writing or reading English, but most people will face situations where they need spoken

communicative language skills. As a student, I often hear classmates complain about language courses neglecting students in oral assignments to prepare them for real-life communication. Such experiences can make education seem irrelevant to communication needs.

Teacher speech and textbook texts can serve as language models to provide examples of speech acts in context. They can also describe how things go wrong and how misunderstandings might arise. However, Bardovi-Harling (2001) argues that such models are not good enough because they lack original material and language function. This problem was also raised by Vallenga (2004) who pointed to several studies showing that English language teaching texts (hereinafter referred to as ELT) failed to portray a realistic picture of conversations with norms and practices. Tateyama (2001) has made another interesting finding.

His review illustrates that students are bored with examples provided as models, and prefer to be involved in the production of language itself. Tateyama (2001) says that “communicative practice improves most aspects of learners' pragmatic abilities…” (p. 220). In other words, there are reasons for demanding that such student involvement in communication be beneficial for developing pragmatic competence.

Pragmatic competence, like other types of competence, is considered as something that students "possess, develop, gain, use or lose" (Kasper, 1997, inconceivable). In other words, it cannot be taught through chalkboard instruction, but takes practice, experience, and hands-on focus. Pragmatics can be defined as how meaning is related to context. In interactions, meaning emerges as a result of negotiating meaning between interlocutors. Meaning is created somewhere between what the speaker wants to express, and how the listener understands speech. By involving students in oral social interaction activities, students are given the opportunity to practice negotiating meaning.

Task-based language teaching, built on the consumption that language learning is best facilitated when students engage in contextual language activities (Ellis, 2009). The success of language activities depends on the designer of the textbook creating meaningful assignments, and engaging students in a variety of different language functions, aspects of discourse and patterns of verbal exchange. Such a focus will prepare students for the communication situations that await them in real life. Fair, informative and descriptive task instructions are also essential for this process.

Textbooks can be defined as “published books, most often produced for commercial gain, whose explicit purpose is to assist foreign English learners in enhancing their linguistic knowledge and / or communicative skills” (Sheldon, 1987, p. 1). Although the props / media have changed a lot due to digitization, textbooks still hold firm to the foundation of teaching. This section will describe research on the status of textbooks in schools, and the relevance of studying this type of material.

Textbooks have been visualized as "the visible crux of any ELT program" (Sheldon, 1988, p. 237). For many, it has been considered the most important instructional tool used in classrooms to teach English as a foreign language (Summer, 2011; Vallenga, 2004). Gilje (2016) points to the current mixed learning trends when it comes to AIDS teaching. Mixed learning can be understood as “language courses that combine face-to-face (F2F) classroom components with appropriate use of technology” (Sharma & Barrett, 2007, p. 7). In relation to teaching aids, blended learning can be defined as a classroom practice that uses paper-based material (such as textbooks) and digital resources.

Today, most textbooks have additional digital tools, and are presented in a digital version format. Despite digitization, textbooks play a central role in Indonesian classrooms has been documented in reports presented on behalf of the Directorate of Education and Training . The report states that teachers consider textbooks to be an important resource in the course planning process (Juuhl, Hontvedt&Skjelbred, 2010). Students also reported high textbook use, especially referring to test preparation. In addition, the report revealed that students spent a lot of time working on assignments from their textbooks. Other sets of information that support the central role of textbooks are available in libraries or on the internet or in other online worlds.

II. RESEARCH METHOD

The methodology applied in this study benefits from mixed methods. It has been used to perform theoretical textbook analysis. In order to secure objectivity and consistency in carrying out learning, criteria for oral assignments and pragmatic competences have been developed and will be presented in this chapter.

Within the field of research methods there appears to be much discussion that differentiates qualitative and quantitative research methods. Holliday (2007), for example, states that both methods contain other elements, and vice versa. To separate the two methods, however, can be helpful because it

"represents a useful means of classifying the different methods of social research…" (Bryman, 2012, p. 35), and will therefore be used in this analysis. The two methods cover different trends with respect to the research process and results, but Bryman (2012) admits that they may also include a similar strategy because the differences are not set in stone. Paltridge and Phakiti (2015) say: "The main difference between quantitative and qualitative research lies in the type of data the researchers collect" (p. 12). Qualitative research presents findings through descriptions and illustrated discussions in words, whereas quantitative research presents numerical data. Research which includes the trend of both research methods is therefore increasingly referred to as mixed methods research (Bryman, 2012). Paltridge and Phakiti (2015) also define such research as a study that combines quantitative and qualitative research. Since I found it useful for my studies to apply strategies in both areas of research, I decided to undertake a mixed methods research. Such methodologies may provide mutual reinforcement to strengthen the quality of the study.

The reason for including quantitative methods is that they are especially useful when working with larger data sets. This study might benefit from a methodology that provides insight into the numerical distribution of tasks related to pragmatics. Such representations make it easy to compare findings across textbooks. Quantitative research is interested in investigating trends (Bjørndal, 2011), which has served my research question well because I have studied certain aspects of three textbooks. I want to explicitly emphasize that this study is not fundamentally a comparative analysis. However, comparisons were made when I presented the findings separately in Quantitative analysis. Quantitative methods also make it easier for you to stay objective about conducting your research, which increases the reliability of your research. I decided to use a quantitative method file to map and calculate oral assignments in textbooks. It allows me to illustrate how much material I've worked on executing a project, compared to other types of assignments. It also helps me select data for analysis.

According to Paltridge and Phakiti (2015) "qualitative researchers allow themselves to be involved in formulating meanings and interpretations of what they observe" (p. 13). They also separate this method from quantitative methods by referring to the facts in qualitative research analyzing data "collected through interviews, observations, text or pictures, not in numbers" (Paltridge&Phakiti, 2015, p. 12). Apart from conducting an in-depth analysis of quantitative findings

(discussing the positive and negative aspects of trends), I am interested in how these Aspects are presented to students through job descriptions and objectives. This part, therefore the analysis will not be based on numbers alone, but on textual analysis when going through an oral assignment.

The analysis results come from theoretical textbook analysis. The experimental second version considers the use of textbooks in practice by a teacher in a specific contextual setting, and evaluates the effects of the material applied in the classroom. Theoretical textbook analysis, on the other hand, relies on examining textbooks exclusively through an evaluative framework. The choice of analytical theoretical textbooks allowed me to work with a set of concrete materials, which would likely influence the teaching of pragmatic competences. Moreover, it allows for a consideration of the negative and positive features of the material. The centrality of the textbook highlights the importance of quality teaching materials. Textbooks are a source of input and knowledge of language, in addition to creating opportunities for oral interaction among students. It would, of course, be interesting to consider how teachers and students view textbook assignments in practice. Due to the choice of topic and the deadline for this project, no such data was collected yet.

In order to find a task that creates opportunities for oral interaction / production, explicit criteria must be selected. In addition to criteria (made with reference to Hackman, 1969; Littlejohn, 2011,), Willis's definition of communicative tasks (cited in Littlewood, 2004) was considered when mapping oral textbook assignments: “assignments are always activities in which the target language used by students for communicative purposes (goals) to achieve results ”(p. 321).

In short, I have analyzed any task that is meant to be performed orally. Oral communication skills are listed in LK06 (2013) and byCommon European Framework of Reference for Languages (2001. Therefore, textbook assignments should provide opportunities for oral communication practice. Apart from eliminating material for analysis, location criteria and counting the oral assignments presented, allow readers to understand what counts as oral assignments in my workspace. It will also give readers an understanding of the amount of material processed in this analysis, compared to other activity in the book.

To be able to consider oral tasks’ potential to raise students’ pragmatic competences, and what aspects the

different tasks contain, I have based my analysis on the elements of pragmatic competences outlined in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (2001. The different skills that make up such competences are listed in section analysis. In addition, I have used the Threshold Level's (1991) lists of language functions to identify the different criteria. I aim to map the frequency of the different criteria in oral tasks, i.e how many times the skills are required to be used when solving them. I am also interested in the explicitness of metapragmatic information present in tasks. The questions below have guided the analysis (the questions are adapted for the purpose of studying textbooks, based on questions for consideration, presented in the,Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (2001 p. 130.)

1. What discourse features is the learner required to control?
2. What microfunctions and macrofunctions is the learner required to produce?
3. What interaction schemata is required of the learner?

In my case, the questions opt for considering what aspects of pragmatics students are required to practice using, while working with their textbooks. The analysis has been carried out by going through the oral tasks, studying them independently to map the frequency of discourse features, type of micro or macrofunctions and interaction schemata. The Threshold Level (1991) was used to identify and recognize language functions and communicative events to spot the dialogue types. In addition to the previously mentioned aspects of pragmatics, I have included two social communication situations, due to their centrality in the textbooks: having a debate and giving a presentation. These are not explicitly referred to in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (2001 in relation to pragmatic competences, but are all mentioned as central communicative activities. Due to LK06's (2013) focus on students being able to adjust their language according to the language situation, I found these necessary to include. As interaction schemata are not always complete communication situations, I found it beneficial to include these situations.

Table 1 Criteria for pragmatic competences

Discourse competence	**Micro functions**	**Macro functions**	**Interaction schemata**	**Communication situations**
Thematic development	Imparting and seeking factual information	Persuasion	Making purchases	Having a debate

Turn taking	Expressing and finding out attitudes	Argumentation	Ordering food and drinks	Giving a presentation
Flexibility to circumstances	Suasion	Instruction	Asking for information	
Coherence and cohesion	Socializing	Description	Meeting people	
	Structuring discourse	Summarization	Asking and showing the way	
	Communication repair	Narration	Asking and telling the time	
			Inviting and reacting to invitation	
			Arranging accommodation	
			Proposing a course of action and reacting to such proposals	
			Having a discussion	

To illustrate my way of action, I will present two examples of how the analysis was carried out. I wish to illustrate how I went about marking the skills based on the criteria and a textual analysis. The examples are also provided to illustrate some of the issues I have encountered in carrying out the analysis, such as the subjective aspect in carrying out such an analysis.

For or against

What makes football so fascinating? Many people claim that there is too much football on the television, that football players earn too much money, and that the problem of hooliganism is not taken seriously enough.

In groups of 3-4, discuss these statements. Try to find facts that support them and facts that prove them wrong. Then have a discussion where a group of people, for instance family, friends or colleagues, discuss the importance of football. Act out this debate.

In the analysis, I marked this task as creating opportunities for considering thematic development, turn taking, flexibility to circumstances, coherence and cohesion, imparting and seeking factual information, expressing and finding out attitudes, structuring discourse, argumentation, having a discussion and a debate. When deciding on what criteria the task fulfilled, I performed a textual

analysis identifying what words were most important in indicating student actions.

The first word indicating expectations of student actions is discuss. This word is actually mentioned twice in the instructions. To carry out a successful discussion, students are also asked to find facts to support or prove them wrong. Next, the act of carrying out a discussion is requested, before it should develop into a debate. Such a textual analysis therefore led me to consider what aspects of pragmatic competences students might engage in. When it comes to discourse competence, the discussion about football encourages thematic development in terms of following a logical structure presenting points and arguments where/when appropriate. Coherence and cohesion is also relevant as learners have to produce meaningful contributions to the conversation using cohesive devices and organizational patterns. As they are provided with discourse roles in a context such as family members, they have to adjust to their roles, hence flexibility to circumstances.

The microfunctions are: imparting and seeking factual information, expressing and finding out attitudes and structuring discourse. These are relevant in the way that students are asked to "find facts" (hence seeking information), but also discuss them among themselves (hence attitudes). Next, students are supposed to interact which might encourage the use of structuring discourse, such as: correcting oneself (No, sorry, I mean, that is to say), expressing an opinion (I think), etc. The macrofunction of argumentation is also included as learners are asked to seek arguments that favor the statements or prove them wrong when engaging in discussion /debate. Finally, discussion is encouraged as they first are to discuss the input provided in the task, before performing a topic-related debate. It is, however, evident that such an analysis is based on a subjective opinion as the results are dependent on my understanding of the task instructions. Next, I will include an example from Access to English, to illustrate the problems I encountered when categorizing the tasks:

UNDERSTANDING THE TEXT

a) Imagine that you are preparing a radio interview with Archie Roach about his experiences of being a "stolen child". Write down six questions that you would ask him, using the songs as your source of information. For example: "How did your father react when they came to fetch you?"

b) Now sit in pairs and do the interview.

This task was marked for all the components of discourse competence in addition to imparting and seeking factual information, expressing and finding out attitudes, socializing, structuring discourse, description and asking for information. The task allows for students to create their own questions, which makes it difficult to analyze it any further as it might have an even greater potential depending on what the students ask. Such information would, however, only be available to me if I carried out an experimental textbook analysis, but this is not the case. Instead my analysis shows the potential of the tasks. Low achieving students would most likely not be able to see all opportunities presented to them by the textbooks, because of restricted task instructions (see section 2.4). Whereas higher achieving students might have more strategies and experience to go on and could therefore start a grand discussion and manage to keep the conversation going.

Due to time limits, I will not discuss every criterion in depth, but instead focus on a few criteria with reference to the findings. I am interested in the amount of information provided for the students in order to make them consider contextual factors, in addition to the level of explicitness when it comes to metapragmatic instructions.

Something that could have complemented this project is teachers', students' and textbook designers' reflections. I do not know how teachers instruct students when it comes to tasks, what additional texts or information they incorporate with the textbook or how they supplement in terms of pragmatics. In relation to additional pragmatic information, Vallenga (2004) points to teacher surveys revealing the limited amount of outside materials related to pragmatics, taken into classrooms to complement textbooks. I have no empirical research of how students understand and perceive the tasks they are given, and how they perceive their education regarding pragmatics. Such information would have contextualized the thesis even more. I did, however, choose not to perform such an analysis as all students understand things differently. For this reason, I find a textual analysis of textbook tasks as relevant as any other aspect listed above.

Categorizing the different aspects of pragmatic competences in the textbooks has been a challenging procedure. Ambiguous task instructions have made it hard to map the potential of the task in raising pragmatic competences. The quantitative nature of this analysis is to some extent weakened as it relies on my subjective understanding of tasks'

potential. This could be a limitation as someone who carries out the same analysis, might end up with different quantitative results. The variations in quantitative findings should, however, not be critical for the overall results as the aim of the thesis is to map the possibilities a task has for developing pragmatic competences. The criteria used enabled me to approach the tasks with the same set of analytical tools, to reduce variations in findings. Another restriction to the thesis is the fact that I have chosen to leave out the online tasks due to time limits. This is unfortunate as I lose some of the essence of the textbooks as the online tasks are a part of the teaching material.

The analysis performed does not provide the reader with information on the amount of oral production demanded from the students. Does it demand a simple yes or no answer, a sentence, or does it demand students to produce a paragraph-length of an utterance? I will not be able to present any quantitative findings on this, with the exception of the aspect of coherence and cohesion dealt with in the tasks. The amount of oral production is, however, touched upon in the qualitative analysis of pragmatic development.

III. FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter aims to present and discuss findings of the current textbook analysis performed in mapping opportunities for developing L2 pragmatics in oral textbook tasks. Quantitative findings are presented in tables and discussed along with qualitative findings related to the research question.

Oral Textbook Tasks

By calculating the percentage of oral textbook tasks, I want to account for how many opportunities students have to use their oral skills. Student centered activities and use of oral language has proved beneficial in terms of language learning, and is therefore relevant for this thesis. As already mentioned in section 3.3.1, I have included all tasks containing oral interaction possibilities. Table 2 illustrates the number of oral tasks across the material.

Table 2 Number of oral tasks in the textbooks

Textbook	Oral tasks	Other tasks	All tasks	% of oral tasks
Targets	58	132	190	31%
Access to English	46	63	109	42%
New Experience	67	101	158	36%

Findings reveal that Access to English has the highest percentage of oral tasks (42%) followed by New Experience

(36%) and Targets (31%). Based on criteria used to map oral tasks, the tasks accounted for in table 2, secure oral participation in English. Findings indicate that these textbook designers considered oral interaction in English to be an important part of developing skills and knowledge within the subject. This is interesting as learner centered tasks with opportunities for oral interaction have not always been a priority in school (see section 2.3.4). Fortunately, society's turn towards a global world and language community is reflected also in textbook tasks. Being able to communicate orally allows learners to participate in the international society, gaining knowledge about different cultures and ways of life.

As previously mentioned, this relates to Bakhtin (referred to in John-Steiner, 2007), Fisher (2008), and Bardovi-Harling (2001), who point to the importance of making language one's own through use, and by transferring personal ideas into words. Based on theory presented in chapter two: Newby's (2006) findings on limited oral production in CLT classrooms, Westgate's (1997) report on students not engaging in talk, and lacking instructions in textbooks to develop pragmatic competences (Vallenga, 2004), create grounds to consider how learners in Vg1 are engaged in oral tasks. Textbook designers should provide learners with well created tasks which have the potential of developing communicative competences. The present analysis is therefore based on the oral tasks accounted for in table 2.

Pragmatic Competences

As already mentioned, the main aim of the thesis is to map the potentials for developing pragmatic competences. The discussion of tables with quantitative findings will also benefit from qualitative findings on metapragmatic instruction. For organizational purposes, the findings are presented thematically according to criteria presented in chapter three. The tables present the frequency of potentially different linguistic output demanded by learners. The quantitative tables are provided to assist readers in seeing what aspects of pragmatic competences students are introduced to, and therefore might be ready to encounter in real life tasks. In addition, the tables reveal situations and language functions with which learners will have little experience. The results are based on task description, instruction, and amount of information/aids provided for the learners when approaching the task. When studying the tables, I want to draw the reader's attention to the diverging overall task number present across the textbooks. This naturally reflects the numbers presented.

Also, there are some tasks that are not accounted for in the tables, as they do not have the potential of developing pragmatic competences. In these tasks, students were asked to repeat a word after the teacher to learn the correct pronunciation, or read something out load. These tasks do, however, not make up a large number, and for this reason, I will not elaborate on this. Even though pragmatic competences were not explicitly mentioned in the books, similarly to the absence in LK06 (2013), textbooks do create opportunities for developing such competences. Which textbook does best in terms of developing pragmatic competences is, however, difficult to project due to the different structures across the textbooks. As I have only studied oral tasks, I do not wish to make such claims. I do, however, consider a relatively high number in each category (in the tables) to be positive findings as every opportunity created is a positive experience for the learner.

Discourse competence

Discourse competence was considered in light of four aspects: flexibility to circumstances, turn-taking, thematic development, and coherence and cohesion. Table 4.2 presents the potentials for student engagement in the different aspects.

Table 3 Discourse competence

Discourse competence	**Number of tasks**		
	Targets	Access to English	New Experience
Flexibility to circumstances	9	11	24
Turn-taking	17	11	30
Thematic development	58	50	60
Coherence and cohesion 93 75 109	93	75	109

The category with the highest number of opportunities is coherence and cohesion, followed by thematic development, turn-taking, and flexibility to circumstances. According to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (2001, these criteria are considered necessary skills when engaging in successful communication. The document encourages gradually providing learners with more challenging situations, in terms of language functions and discourse skills. The importance of discourse competence is reflected in LK06's (2013) aims for students to "be able to adapt the language to different topics and communication situations," (Ministry of Education and Research, p. 2) and the competence aim of being able to "express oneself fluently and

coherently in a detailed and precise manner suited to the purpose and situation"

In general, discourse competence is about being able to present elements of language in a structured, meaningful and logical manner. Findings indicate that students are provided with opportunities to practice such competences. In addition to the quantitative results, qualitative findings show that students are engaged in group talk through discussions, debates, interviews, and other interactions schemata. As mentioned in chapter two, several researchers opt for group work when it comes to developing conversational skills. One such researcher is Cunningsworth (1987) who points to the necessity of letting students experience how discourse works by engaging them in interaction.

These types of task are also pointed to by Westgate (1997), who clearly states that group work is the most successful way of engaging students in conversation. Interactional tasks let students experience the cooperative principle of Grice and how interactions depend on cooperation to develop (see section 2.2.1). Students are also engaged in the dual purpose of group talk, in having to both listen and speak for the conversation to be successful. Students' contributions in conversation should be based on previously shared information and influence how the student intervenes in conversation. Such experiences provide insight into how conversations are organized and managed. A discussion of discourse features will follow in the next section.

Flexibility to circumstances

This criterion was marked when learners were instructed to consider contextual information before engaging in communicative situations. New Experience has the highest number with 24 instances of letting students illustrate flexibility to circumstances. Access to English has 11 instances, closely followed by Targets which has 9. The numbers in this category are relatively low, considering the importance of contextual considerations related to developing pragmatic competences. The low number might originate from the fact that most oral tasks instruct the learner to "discuss this with a partner". Going through questions with a partner or discussing a topic, demands a style and register most likely routinized for most students by the time they reach Ext.1

Still, there are tasks allowing students to use language appropriately to show emphasis, avoid ambiguity and select appropriate language according to interlocutors, situation etc. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (2001. Both social and cultural

contexts are therefore important factors, and how this affects the style of the conversation should be familiar to the students. The importance of context is reflected in Simensen's (2007) definition of pragmatics as "the study of language in its social, situational, and functional context" (p. 67). LK06 (2013) explicitly points to the importance of learners being able to adapt language to different purposes and situations. This includes being able to show politeness, being aware of what levels of formality is suited to different purposes, reformulating language according to language situation and type of conversation.

In order to illustrate flexibility to circumstances, students need to adapt to the different styles of conversations. Quantitative findings illustrate that students are engaged in different types of conversations such as debates, discussions etc. An important finding from the qualitative analysis is the limited amount of information in terms of outcome, purpose, context and suitable phrases, in relation to the different communication situations.

A TELEVISION TALK SHOW
Act out a television talk show on the following topic: Teenage gangs – a menace to society or just friends taking care of each other? Characters present:

a) Stephen Cox: The presenter who introduces the topic and leads the discussion
b) Jenny Fraser: A white girl living in a Hispanic neighborhood
c) Oscar Hijuelos: A former gang member who has spent 5 years in prison
d) Judy Miller: The mother of a boy who was killed in a drive-by shooting
e) Shawn Binchy: A New York officer
f) Barbara Duff: A student counselor at a Washington D.C school

There are no indications on how the talk show is expected to develop. In order for this to become a successful communication situation, it is dependent on teachers engaging students in meta-talk on what functional language is appropriate for talk shows and what the purpose of such shows are. The style and register use of talk shows could also have been discussed prior to solving the task. More information about the social roles could also have been included to scaffold student actions, which could make it easier for students to adjust their behavior to their assigned roles.

Holistic language tasks challenge students' competence to appropriate language to context by engaging them in different styles of conversation. Textbook tasks also provide learners with assigned social roles (characteristics and attitudes) to adapt, in for example debates and

interviews. Assigned roles require students to handle language that has not been routinized prior to the interaction situation. Such tasks engage students in expressing new points of views in conversations and situations different from what they are used to.The different roles provided for the learners present a need to "convey information, to express an opinion or to infer meaning" (Ellis, 2009, p. 223). As a consequence to the assigned social roles, an information gap is created, which provides learners with a purpose for interaction.

Another positive finding on assigning roles to such language activities, is reported by Newell et al. (2011): There is a widespread agreement that school teachers often try to maintain a conflict-free zone when it comes to learning (…) such that maintaining the peace takes precedence over fostering disagreement and other possible sources of conflict that may arise when teaching argumentative reading and writing. (Newell et al., 2011, p. 277).

To avoid disturbing the peace, and students becoming afraid of how the discussions might damage their social relationship with others, assigned roles could be beneficial. This way, they step out of their personal character, and take on another mask separating them from the social role they normally have in the classroom.

The importance of engaging students in tasks with conflicting parties is stressed by Newell et al. (2011) who say that "one primary purpose for engaging in rival hypothesis thinking is to allow for the open sharing of competing perspectives on an issue so that different parties can collaboratively work together to develop solutions to those issues" (p. 294). Such experiences might prove beneficial as they resemble everyday discussions and issues in communities across the world. The same point is also stressed by Hoff (2014) who says that "according to Backthin and Ricoeur, the potential of communication lies in conflict and the confrontation of ideas, rather than mutual understanding" (p. 513). Such conflicting ideas are (potentially) present in both example 4.below, as learners are provided with roles taking different stands on issues.

Scholars have indicated that some textbooks fail to contextualize their tasks (e.g. Crawford, 2002), which I found to be the case in these textbooks as well. Sometimes, tasks are contextualized as they are linked with texts. Other times, when students are required to engage in a social language activity, I find contextual information to be lacking. A task that

sticks out, compared to example above, is the following:

ACT IT OUT

An Aboriginal community area of Australia applies for "native title" to Anganga territory, an area about 50 square miles. There are storms of protests from farmers and industrialists. The two sides in the dispute are invited to discuss the issue in a radio programme called "Confrontation". Sit in groups of three, give each person one of the roles below – and perform the program.

Role 1: A spokesperson for farmers and industrialists. Tests have shown that Ananga territory is rich in minerals like uranium, bauxite and zinc. What is more, some geologists believe these resources belong to all Australians, not just one small group. It is vital that the land is used for the benefit of everybody. Role 2: A spokesperson for the aboriginal community of Ananga. Ananga territory has been inhabited by your forefathers for 40,000 years and is of great religious importance to you. Mining and drilling here would be like bulldozing a cathedral.

Role 3: The interviewer. Your role is to introduce and round off the programme. You should also try to keep the discussion going. You should, of course, be neutral, but that doesn't mean that you can't ask pointed questions.

This example includes information about roles, and some expectations related to each role, such as the interviewer's role of introducing, rounding off, and keeping the discussion going. This way, students can relate to their roles. If such information is not provided together with the roles, explicit instructions on seeking information elsewhere or engage in collaborative reasoning, should be included. Such instructions could facilitate successful communication.

In terms of students being able to adjust their language according to language situations, they need knowledge about what conversation styles and social interaction situations require different levels of formality. The amount of metapragmatic instruction is also restrictive on this aspect. Only a limited amount of metapragmatic instruction is found in Access to English and Targets. This is noteworthy in relation to the discussion of how learners tend to underuse politeness marking and show context sensitivity when interacting in L2.

Targets, does not include any metapragmatic information on the different levels of formality, but includes a model, separate from the tasks, with traits separating informal from formal language. One such example is the use of incomplete sentences. The information is not referred to or included in relation to tasks. A student questionnaire revealed that only three out of 14 students knew that they had a section on "Learning strategies" in the back of their book. In other words, if this kind of information is not explicitly referred to in tasks, it is not likely that

students themselves start looking for information.

If provided with such information, however, learners can also answer to why they act a certain way and what factors contributed to their choice of language (meta-talk). In addition, they are more likely to be open for interpretation in communication situations, as they have experienced using language in different situations and for different purposes. Such tasks also prepare students to further consider contextual factors in interaction. For this reason, I would argue, that students should be provided with explicit (but also implicit) contextual information when practicing using their oral language also in textbook tasks.

Turn-taking

In relation to turn-taking, there is no metapragmatic information included in the textbooks. There are, however, opportunities for students to draw on skills handling turn-taking in discourse. New Experience includes 30 such activities, Targets: 17 and Access to English: 11. Compared to the overall number of tasks, this number is also low. Turn-taking was only marked when there was a need for students to use turn-taking techniques. For this reason, tasks that express a desire for students to impart factual information, express attitudes, describe a character in the book etc. do not require such skills as no more than one or two turns are required to carry out the task.

The criterion was marked for social interaction activities requiring learners to draw on turn-taking skill in tasks such as debates, structured discussions and role plays. Both examples above were marked for turn-taking with the interviewer and talk show host monitoring turn-taking and other participants having to use turn-taking techniques to gain the floor to express one's meaning. When it comes to group work, research shows that students often sit quietly, and do not engage in discussion. If learners do not know how to, or when to engage in interaction, he or she might drop trying. According to the CEFR (2001) students are dependent on a large range of discourse functions to be able to hold the floor to gain time while thinking. They also need knowledge on when it is appropriate to intervene, in terms of being able to read signals and knowledge on what functions to use to ask for attention.

Returning to role plays, Kasper and Dahl (quoted in Bardovi-Harling, 2013), claim that role plays "represent oral production, full operation of the turn-taking mechanism, impromptu planning decisions contingent on interlocutor input, and hence negotiation of global and local goals, including negotiation of meaning" (p. 71). Role plays allow for students to

figure out what turn-taking functions suit the purpose of the situation better, or they might experience how some functions misfire. Even though role plays take place within the walls of the classroom for pedagogic reasons, Kasper (1997) argues that classroom discourse is as authentic as any other form of talk. I think such talk can at least prepare students for situations where turn-taking is necessary in real life communication.

Role plays differ in terms of working method across the textbooks. Sometimes students are asked to act out a scripted play, write one before carrying it out, or simply act out a situation spontaneously. I believe that all methods, whether it is spontaneous or not, serve students well. In earlier teaching paradigms, such as the audio lingual, scripted responses were most common. Such role plays can provide students with language models on how turn-taking could take place. It might also introduce students to new ways of getting or holding the floor in conversations, by presenting linguistic forms to use in order to appropriately interrupt in the conversation. Based on qualitative findings from the textbook analysis, there is an evident trend of not providing students with scripted language.

Role plays have the potential of involving students in authentic turn-taking situations. Learners have to interpret when it is natural to engage in conversations based on interlocutors' pauses, drop in intonation or phases indicating that a turn is over. They also get to consider the cooperative principle of Grice (1975) stressed in CEFR's (2001) description of discourse competence. Learners are also let to experience how other people might have different understandings of when turns are over or how they behave in relation to turn-taking. Also, how it might feel natural to express agreement, and confirmation that one is paying attention to what is said.

> SPEAKING
>
> It's Saturday night and you are supposed to be home by midnight. Your cellphone has been turned off and your parents have tried to contact you. Act out the dialogue that takes place when you finally get home – at 2 am.

This example is what Samuda and Bygate (2008) refer to as a holistic language activity. Students are asked to focus on getting their meaning across, and consider appropriate language to achieve it. The aim of the task is language learning through processes. In general, most tasks throughout the textbooks are meaning focused, opposed to form focused. Students must draw on several language skills to carry out the role play, and turn-taking skills might become crucial for

learners to defend coming in late. They might have to fight for the floor in order to present their explanation. I do, however, miss the element of meta-talk and preparation time prior to the role play. Referring to the previous section on contextual factors, this situation is probably relatable for students as they are familiar with the context of breaking a curfew and interacting with their parents. This creates context to the task. Knowledge about context might therefore make it easier for learners to take part in a discussion on what language would suit the purpose.

Thematic development

Table 4.2 shows that New Experience has 60 instances requiring thematic development, Targets has 58, whereas Access to English has 50. Thematic development was mostly marked in relation to macrofunctions, interaction schemata, and communication situations. Instances were recorded in terms of tasks requiring students to include introduction, developed points and concluding remarks (e.g. in presentations). Also, in tasks encouraging learners to participate in communication situations requiring them to be aware of and follow the thematic development in situations (e.g. debates). Thematic development is also reflected in LK06's (2013) aim to enable students to: "introduce, maintain and terminate conversations and discussions about general and academic topics related to one's education programme" (Ministry of Education and Research, p. 10).

To handle this skill one needs knowledge about the topic of discussion and/or awareness of personal opinions. Another important consideration is the order of information presented. For this reason, students need to be aware of the different internal structures of different communication situations. Being able to follow such structures is crucial in order to observe and act according to the norms related to different situations. To be understood, taken seriously and present a strong case, students must present well developed thematic arguments. Structure is key, but is also something that students are struggling with. They should therefore be provided with opportunities to engage in processes that demand them to develop a line of arguments, summarize and conclude. Such practices are important in developing such skills.

Telling a story based on a list of points, which is recognized as the lowest competence level within this aspect, is not a frequent type of task across the textbooks. This might be because the Ext.1 level, should be considered a quite advanced level as it might be the last year that learners study English at school. There are, however, instances of

summarizing texts, telling short stories, and tasks requiring students to develop short arguments by sub-questions: why do you think this? The number of tasks that encourage students to back up their opinions with arguments, is also limited. If less motivated students are not explicitly asked to back up their argument, they will most likely not do it. The sub-question of "why" following a question, could however ensure that students are able to defend their argument, and for it to eventually become a routinized procedure.

When it comes to oral presentations, a lot of task instructions require students to simply find information and present is. Tasks do not explicitly require students to consider the thematic development in the process. I believe that more informative task instructions could better secure the handling of thematic development. Such instructions should include information on structure of the conversation, be a reminder to include points and arguments for or against different matters, and to conclude in a logical manner. This way, I believe thematic development would come natural for more students.

Coherence and cohesion

The aspect of coherence and cohesion relates to thematic development as it is essential in terms of securing flow in the language, illustrating relationship between ideas, discourse patterns and types of cohesion. The criteria were marked in tasks if students were asked to produce longer stretches of sentences, and therefore would have to consider how to link the utterance together in a meaningful manner. Table 3 presents relatively high numbers as regards this aspect; New Experience range highest with 109 potentials, followed by Targets with 93, and finally Access to English with 75. Compared to the total number of tasks, most activities demand more than one sentence as an answer.

Students must produce language where structure and connectors should be considered to secure flow in the utterance. The importance of students handling this aspect of pragmatic competences is reflected in LK06's (2013) aim of developing students who are able to express themselves "fluently and coherently in a detailed and precise manner suited to the purpose and situation". Based on personal experience14, linking words are often referred to in classrooms. They are, however, not naturally acquired and used by students without explicit focus on implementing them. One task that does focus on linking words is presented in example below.

Linking words
Bobotie is a traditional South-African dish made with minced meat, white bread and eggs. In the recipe below, the cooking directions have been jumbled. Place the directions in the correct order, using the linking devices below instead of the letters a-e. Explain why you think this must be the right way to make the dish.
Firstly/first- secondly/second- next- then- finally
a) Beat the eggs with the milk and pour over the meat. Garnish with the leaves.
b) Mix in all the other ingredients except the butter, eggs, milk and bay leaves.
c) Bake in the oven at 180 degrees Fahrenheit until set, about 50 minutes. d) Soak the break in milk, squeeze to remove the milk and mix the bread with the minced beef. e) Melt the butter in a frying pan and brown the meat mixture lightly in it. Turn out into a casserole.

Linking words are referred to other places across the textbooks, but not in relation to oral tasks. Targets, includes a section on the matter with metapragmatic instruction (see p. 223), but this is not referred to in oral tasks. There is reason to believe that a reference to this section would benefit students as it includes information about the importance of cohesion. In addition to a short informative paragraph, Targets provides he readers with examples, followed by explanations of what signal each of the linking words send to the listener. Access to English, also includes metapragmatic information about coherence, but only links it to written English.

Functional competences

These kinds of competences make up learner ability in knowing and using functional language for different communication purposes. Table 3 and 4 present quantitative findings of what language functions students are provided with opportunities to practice using. Table 4.5 shows the number of times students are engaged in certain patterns of verbal exchange. In relation to these opportunities, students have to draw on their linguistic resources and pragmatic knowledge to produce suitable utterances. Other times, students are provided with metapragmatic instruction on which to base their choice of language. This section will provide the reader with a discussion of findings and examples to illustrate this.

Microfunctions

This category represents what functional purposes learners are required to handle when using the English language orally.

Table 4Microfunctions

Microfunctions		Number of tasks	
Imparting and seeking factual information	93	65	81
Expressing and finding out	75	57	80

attitudes			
Suasion	8	10	1
Socializing	5	8	15
Structuring discourse	6	12	21
Communication repair	0	1	0

Findings indicate that imparting and seeking factual information and expressing and finding out attitudes, are the most frequent functions required in oral textbook tasks. Following, ranged high too low, are structuring discourse, socializing, suasion and communication repair. The latter categories are considerably minor in terms of opportunities created. Starting with imparting and seeking factual information, this functional purpose is often required in relation to questions following literary texts, performing research on different themes, creating questions for interviews, and making presentations. In addition to handle factual information, the Norwegian education system aims to participate in the process of Bildung, by scaffolding learners' intellectual development as democratic citizens. For this reason, education should provide learners with opportunities to develop their opinions through reflection tasks, and functional language to suit the purpose of expressing, but also finding out attitudes. Such tasks enable students to transfer their meaning into English without losing it essence. With reference to Vygotsky and Bakhtin, tasks within this category are beneficial to provide learners with opportunities to discuss such facts. As a result, learners can develop an opinion on the matter.

In addition to engaging students in oral use of language, example 4.5, also provides students with explicit examples of language suited to the functional purpose of expressing attitudes. I do, however, want to critique the task instruction on the wording: "This is, of course, incorrect…". I do not find this statement justifiable for textbook designers, as they have not included any information on what makes it wrong in this task. Also, it might result in students feeling embarrassed as they did not know this. The textbook does, however, include metapragmatic instruction on when I mean is appropriate to use, later in the book:

IMPROVE YOUR LANGUAGE
Does mean mean what you think it means? Sometimes the verb mean can be translated to Norwegian mene and sometimes it can't.

We can use the verb mean in the following contexts: -
å bety, å innebære (om et ord, et tegn, et saksforhold) :
What does the word apartheid really mean? –
å villesi, presisereenbetydning: What do you mean by calling me

"boy", officer? –
å ha isinne, å ha tilhensikt: He means to have his revenge.

When we are referring to having an opinion (å ha enmening), we cannot use the verb mean. Instead we must use verbs like think or believe- or we use a different construction altogether. Jegmener at regjeringabørgå av. I think the government should resign. I believe the government should resign. In my opinion the government should resign.

The microfunction of expressing and finding out attitudes, is frequently required in everyday talk. Being able to take part in social discussion situations is an important part of participating in social communities. Engaging students in tasks, such as example above, can prepare them for similar group talk where they have to use this microfunction. Such microfunctions are often a part of a bigger conversation, and group talk is for this reason a good way to practice using them. This way, students must relate to other peoples' ideas, consider how and when to interfere in conversation and adjust to the formality of the setting. Insight into what is appropriate to do in such situations is important to be considered a part of the social sphere and avoid being marginalized.

Another microfunction is suasion and includes functional purposes of making suggestions, requests, warnings, advice, to encourage etc. In other words, it is about making a change. The number of opportunities throughout the textbooks is relatively low. Referring to chapter two, Cunningsworth (1987) opts for students to experience trying to apologize without causing offence. Access to English, which has the most opportunities for students to practice suasion (10 marked tasks), includes a similar activity in example 4 below.

ROLE PLAY
Work in pairs. The scene is a restaurant in the small town of Bigotsville.

Role A You are a stranger to this town. You are just passing through and you have been on the road for a long time. You are very hungry and delighted to have found this restaurant, the only one in the town with your favourite dish – roast duck – on the menu. Make your order.

Role B The restaurant you work at is reserved for people with brown eyes/blue eyes (whatever colour your partner does not have). There is a perfectly good (and slightly cheaper) restaurant for people with the other eye colour just across the street. Persuade your unwanted customer to leave, in the nicest possible way. After all, you have your regular

customers to take into account.

An important aspect of pragmatics is how interlocutors experience utterances in conversations. Such considerations are crucial in terms of pragmatics. Example 4 explicitly encourages learners to persuade a person in the nicest way possible to leave the restaurant. The interlocutor (role B) must consider how he or she can ask the guest to leave and avoid that the guest is feeling embarrassed and disrespected. This way, the learner has to consciously consider how to create a "particular effect", as Leech (1983, p.51), put it, in the mind of the unwelcomed guest. The elaborated purpose and goal of the role play is evident in this task. Such a task also allows for the speakers to experience how effective their choice of wording is, as they see how participants react.

The last microfunction is communication repair, which was only identified once. Even though it might occur more times than marked, it was not explicitly demanded in tasks. There were no explicit language examples or information included on the matter either.

MacrofunctionsMacrofunctions were marked if students were asked to produce a sequence of sentences. The different discourse areas, require different skills, and can therefore be separated into macrofunctions. The potentials of the different functions are outlined in table 5.

Microfunctions

Macrofunctions		Number of tasks	
Persuasion	3	3	0
Argumentation	36	29	49
Instruction	1	2	4
Description	30	20	21
Summarization	2	2	3
Narration 1 0 1	1	0	1

The first communication purpose listed in the table is persuasion. In terms of this, Targets and Access to English each contain three opportunities, whereas New Experience, does not explicitly require students to take part in this macrofunction. Being aware of how people use persuasive language is important as language has proved powerful, for example in terms of rhetoric. Targets includes metapragmatic information in relation to tasks, in addition to referring to metapragmatic information further back in the book. Here is how Targets presents information on persuasive speech in relation to a role play:

Role play: the art of persuasion

Online, Hannah has seen a lovely Louis Vuitton handbag. Since her eighteenth birthday is coming up, she decides to talk her father into giving her this hand-bag as a birthday present. Usually, Hannah would have settled with something more affordable. However, last night she overheard her dad telling her mum that he has just been

promoted, which will involve a significant pay rise. Yet, when Hannah approaches her father, he declares that the handbag is a waste of good money.

In pairs, act out the scene. Before you start, write down 3-4 arguments to support your character's claim. Afterwards, discuss the persuasive techniques that each of you used. Were they successful?

In persuasive speech or writing, the key is to make an effective argument.
Pathos (emotion): Use words and examples that appeal to the emotional side of your audience.
Logos (logic): Use facts, statistics, examples.
Ethos (credibility): Make your audience believe you are an expert, or refer to someone who is.

The textbox listed below the task, helps learners to understand how persuasion is created and could raise students' awareness on persuasive techniques. As previously pointed out, the information might facilitate the role play better if explicitly referred to in the task instructions. Such knowledge is beneficial for learners to interpret situations when such techniques are used towards them. Also, it helps them engage in using the techniques when needed. Pragmatics is not only about how to use language, but also being aware of how other people use it.

Students are engaged in meta-talk on how their persuasive techniques worked in the conversation which might develop students' metacognition. In other words, Targets includes both awareness raising and practical activities on the matter, in relation to the question raised for consideration in the CEFR (2001) on whether pragmatic development should be facilitated "by awareness-raising (analysis, explanation, terminology, etc.) in addition to practical activities?" (p. 154). I find such ways of working beneficial as learners might have a greater chance of acquiring the knowledge as they practice using the information through different mediums. First, they read the information, and then they try to use it in a context, before discussing the effect of the techniques. Being able to metacognitively identify and reflect on language strategies have proved beneficial for learners when evaluating effectiveness of them. For this reason, it is beneficial that Targets encourages students to reflect on the effectiveness of their persuasive techniques.

Interaction schemata

Interaction schemata are about understanding what comes next in conversation, and what is expected of participants in the situation. Learners should be aware of situations known to include repetitive patterns of verbal

exchange. This way they would avoid misunderstandings and it would facilitate higher fluency in conversations. Table 4.5 presents the potentials for student engagement in handling the schemata.

Schemata

Interaction schemata		Number of tasks	
Making purchases	0	0	1
Ordering food and drinks	0	2	0
Asking for information	9	9	21
Meeting people	7	5	7
Asking and showing the way	0	0	1
Asking the time	0	0	0
Inviting and reacting to an invitation	0	0	2
Arranging accommodation	0	0	0
Proposing a course of action and reacting to such proposals	3	3	5
Having a discussion	33	27	31

Findings indicate a great variety in terms of opportunities created across the categories. The numbers are relatively low, with some exceptions. Asking for information, meeting people, proposing a course of action and reacting to such proposals, and having a discussion, are four interaction schemata that stand out in terms of frequency.

Communication situations

Communication situations presented in this section differ from the interaction schemata discussed above as presentations and debates include a more formal structure and set expectations. How textbooks create tasks and instruct students in the process, in terms of giving a presentation and performing a debate, is discussed in this section. Table 4.6 presents the quantitative findings across the textbooks.

Communication situations

Communication situations		Number of tasks	
	Targets	Access to English	New Experie
Targets Access to English	2	2	4
Giving a presentation	9	8	13

This Table reveals that Targets and Access to English has two potential for engaging students in debates, whereas New Experience has double the amount (4). As mentioned in the previous chapter, Access to English, presents definitions of different types of conversations. Debates are defined in the following way: “a debate is a discussion between opposing viewpoints that follows certain rules” (Access to English, p. 127). For this reason, there seems to be blurred lines between having a discussion and having a debate, as some of the tasks accounted for under discussion could develop into debates. Following the definition presented in the previous paragraph,

Access to English includes linguistic examples of how to do different things with our language such as making suggestions, expressing an opinion, expressing agreement, expressing disagreement etc. (p. 127). Access to English includes a modelling example which leads up to student engagement in a similar debate. It begins to explain the aim of formal debates, before moving on to the role of the chair (keep order, and be the neutral moderator), the proposers (present arguments) and the speakers (critical questions and comments). The aims of formal debates are also included in terms of how the debate should end in a vote to decide which side of the matter "won" the debate. It also asks students to prepare arguments. Similar instruction (to prepare arguments) was also present in example 3.1 on discussing and debating (in a less formal manner) what makes football so fascinating. I believe that explicitly asking students to prepare arguments and get to know their point of views on the matter before getting engaged in the debate is beneficial. These preparations facilitate a better debate as students are less likely to run out of arguments. Such activities might also raise students' awareness on their roles and therefore act more pragmatically correct in the given situation.

Students are explicitly asked to consider the audience and show context sensitivity as the audience might not know all the difficult words. Different elements of a presentation are also presented and their individual purpose explained. The textbook also encourages learners to involve their personal experiences, which I find beneficial. In addition, learners are provided with appropriate ways to starts the different parts, which facilitates a coherent presentation. Compared to Targets, these phrases are more appropriate suggestions related to textbook tasks on how to start and end a presentation: Today I am going to talk about, the topic of my presentation is, that brings me to etc. The phrases are of less formal character and are better suited to the classroom situation. I also want to point out that textbook designers refer to these pages in several tasks on oral presentations, to scaffold the learners in the process.

IV. CONLUSION

The main purpose of this study has been to map the potentials for developing pragmatic competences in three textbooks for Ext.1. The research has been carried out through a theoretical textbook analysis of oral textbook tasks. The framework used to carry out the analysis has relied on a set of criteria based on the Common European Framework of Reference for

Languages (2001)outline of pragmatic competences. In addition, relevant literature within the field of pragmatics and CLT has been used to discuss qualitative findings on metapragmatic instruction. This chapter sums up the main findings, regarding the research question presented in section 1. It also suggests further research.

Potentials of Developing Pragmatic Competences to my knowledge, there is no research performed on how government textbooks facilitate the development of pragmatic competences in oral tasks. Textbooks are central in education, and textbook tasks have been reported to be actively used in classrooms. Pragmatic competences enable learners to participate in successful communication and therefore as participants in the global world community. Oral practice in handling communication situations similar to real life could therefore be beneficial in language learning classes. According to my findings, pragmatics seem to have made its way into LK06 (2013) and textbooks used for teaching and learning English. However, the present study identifies central aspects where there is room for improvement in relation to oral textbooks tasks. In general, textbooks touch upon most aspects of pragmatic competences mentioned in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (2001). Students are engaged in practicing oral language related to different aspects of discourse competence and functional competence. They are also engaged in giving a presentation and having a debate. Despite the potential opportunities created for practicing pragmatic competences in oral tasks, simple task instructions with few directions and encouragements might limit the effect of the tasks. In other words, tasks could have been better facilitated in terms of providing guidelines of actions and steps regarding how they should be carried out to better scaffold the process.

As stated in the introduction chapter, further research related to classroom practices could provide answers as to methodologies and approaches for developing pragmatic competences. This study purposes to present findings relevant for teachers and textbook designers. First, this study aims to raise teachers' awareness of the importance of pragmatic competences. It could also prove beneficial as means of understanding how pragmatics are tied to communicative competences, and its importance to engage in successful communication. Such competences are central in terms of successful participation in discourse communities. Second, the present study could also help teachers to better

understand the complex concept of pragmatics. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (2001) is study may enable teachers to improve their understanding of pragmatic competences presented in the and how these are reflected in textbooks and LK06 (2013). The Council of Europe's presentation of pragmatic competences might become too theoretical for many, for which, I find it beneficial to present theory linked together with practical textbook examples to illustrate the relevance of the concept in textbooks. Also, the thesis aims to guide teachers in terms of central research within the field of pragmatics. Third, the findings and discussion presented in chapter four, might also make teachers aware of what elements could be included in tasks, and what types of task might benefit the purpose of developing pragmatic competences better. Since some teachers become textbook writers, future contributors to the field of learning materials could also benefit from this study in terms of reflecting on what aspects are emphasized or ignored in oral textbook tasks. This study might also serve as a guide to metapragmatic information related to oral tasks, which could be used in education. It might also raise teachers' understanding of the importance of metapragmatic instruction.

More complex tasks, that engage students in handling a larger range of language functions, could relate more to real communication situations, and thus feel more relevant for students. This could provide learners with experience in trying to handle and consider the different factors in a conversation. New Experience stands out in the tables as it has a relatively high number in most categories, compared to the other books. Based on qualitative findings, this originates in task design as textbook designers engage students in using several functions in one task. This textbook includes more tasks involving students in communication situations not related to texts. In other words, they have less "state your opinion" and "understand the text"- type tasks, compared to the other textbooks.

An interesting element of the qualitative analysis has been how textbook designers consider the question raised in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (2001) on whether pragmatic competences should be developed "by explicit teaching and exercising of functions, verbal exchange patterns and discourse structure" or expected to be develop from their L1 (p. 154). In relation to this, I find textbook designers to be situated somewhere in between the two alternatives. I base this argument on textbook designers neglecting

to include appropriate scaffolding instructions in tasks and the limited amount of metapragmatic instruction in relation to tasks. For this reason, students have a limited potential for developing their pragmatic competences on the basis of oral textbook tasks. Overall, textbook tasks are not a reliable source of pragmatic information by itself. There may be reason to conclude that textbooks are dependent on good language instructors who can provide adequate metapragmatic instruction to develop learners' pragmatic competences.

REFERENCES

[1] Askeland, E. (2013). Grammar teaching in the EFL classroom: an analysis of grammar tasks in three textbooks (Master's thesis). Department of Foreign Languages, University of Bergen.

[2] Balsvik, L., Bratberg, Ø., Henry, J.S., Kagge, J., & Pihlstrøm, R. (2015). Targets (4th ed.) Skien:

[3] Aschehoug. Bardovi-Harling, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence. Grounds for instruction in pragmatics? In K.R Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), Pragmatics in language teaching (pp. 13–32). Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

[4] Bardovi-Harling, K. (2013). Developing L2 pragmatics. Language learning: A journal of research in language studies, 63(1), 68–86. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00738.x

[5] Gyldendal akademisk Brubæk, S. (2013). Pragmatic competence in the EFL classroom: an investigation of the level of pragmatic competence among Norwegian EFL students at the VG1 level (Master's thesis) Department of Teacher Education and School Research, University of Oslo.

[6] Bryman, A. (2012). Social research methods (4th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[7] Burgess, R. & Sørhus, T.B. (2013). Access to English. Oslo:

[8] Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J.C, Richards & R.W Schmidt, R.W. (Eds.), Language and communication (pp. 2–27). London/New York: Longman.

[9] Council of Europe (2001). Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Strasbourg: Language Policy Unit. Retrieved from http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Framework_EN.pdf

[10] Crawford, J. (2002). The role of materials in the language classroom: Finding the balance. In J.C Richards & W.A Renandya (Eds.), Methodology in language teaching (pp. 80–91). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[11] Crystal, D. (2008). Dictionary of linguistics and phonetics (6th ed.) Malden, Mass: Blackwell Publishing.

[12] Cunningsworth, A. (1987). Coursebooks and conversational skills. In L.E. Sheldon. (Ed.), ELT Textbooks and materials: Problems in evaluation and development (pp. 45–54). London: Modern English Publications.

[13] Ellis, R. (2009). Task-based language teaching: sorting out the misunderstandings. International journal of applied linguistics. 19(3). 221–246. doi: 10.1111/j.1473-4192.2009.00231.x

[14] Fisher, D (2008). Why talk is important in classrooms. In D. Fisher, N. Frey & C. Rothenberg (Eds.), Content-area conversations: How to plan discussion-based lessons for diverse language learners. Retrieved from http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/bergen-ebooks/detail.action?docID=410670

[15] Grant, L., & Starks, D. (2001). Screening appropriate teaching materials: Closing from textbooks and television soap operas. International review of applied linguistics in language teaching, 39(1), 39–50. Retrieved form https://search.proquest.com/docview/204968983?accountid=8579

[16] Green, C.F, Christopher, E.R & Lam, J. (2002). Developing discussion skills in the ESL classroom. In J.C Richards & W.A Renandya (Eds.), Methodology in language teaching (pp. 225–233). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[17] Grice, H.P (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole, and J.L Morgan. Syntax and semantics 3: Speech arts (pp .41–58). New York: Academic Press

[18] Heian, B., Lokøy, G., Ankerheim, B., & Drew, I. (2009). New experience (2nd ed.) Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag AS.

[19] Hoff, H.E. (2014). A critical discussion of Byram's model of intercultural communicative competence in the light of Bildung theories. Intercultural Education, 25(6), 508–517. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2014.992112

[20] Holliday. A. (2007). Approaching Qualitative Research. In Doing and writing qualitative research (2nd ed.) (pp. 1–21). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446287958.n1

[21] Johnson, K. (2003). Designing language teaching tasks. New York: Palgrave Mcmillan.

[22] Johnstone, B. (2008). Discourse analysis. (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

[23] Kasper, G (2001). Classroom research on interlanguage pragmatics. In K.R Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), Pragmatics in language teaching (pp. 33–60). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[24] Kasper, G. (2010). Interlanguage pragmatics. In M. Östman, J.O Verschueren & J. Fried (Eds.), Variation and change: Pragmatic perspectives (pp. 141–154). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

[25] Kramsch, C.L. (1981). Discourse analysis and second language teaching. Washington DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

[26] Labov, W. & Waletzky, J. (1967). Narrative Analysis: Oral Versions of Personal Experience. In J. Helm (Ed.), Essays on the verbal and visual arts (pp. 12–44). Seattle: The University of Washington Press.

[27] Lee, J. F. (2000). Tasks and communicating in language classrooms. Boston: McGrawHill. Leech, G.N. (1983). Principles of pragmatics. New York: Longman. Levinson, S.C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[28] Littlejohn, A (2011). The analysis of language teaching materials: inside the Trojan Horse. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), Materials development in language teaching (2nd ed.) (pp. 179–211). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[29] Littlewood, W. (1981). Communicative language teaching: an introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[30] Littlewood, W. (2004). The task-based approach: some questions and suggestions. ELT Journal, 58(4), 319–326. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/58.4.319

[31] McKee, A. (2003). What is Textual Analysis? In Textual analysis (print pp. 2–33). SAGE Publications Ltd. doi: 10.4135/9780857020017.n1

[32] Mey, J.L. (2011). Pragmatikk: en sosial vitenskap. Norsk filosofisk tidsskrift, 46(1), 6–19. Retrieved from https://www.idunn.no/nft/2011/01/art02

[33] Utdanningsdirektoratet. Retrieved from https://www.udir.no/kl06/ENG1-03?lplang=eng

[34] Newby, D. (2006). Communicative language teaching. In A.B., Fenner & D., Newby (Eds.), Coherence of principles, cohesion of competences. Exploring theories and designing material for teacher education (pp. 17–26). Strasbourg Cedex: Council of Europe Publishing.

[35] Newell, G.E., Beach, R., Smith, J., VanDerHeide, J.K., Kuhn, D., & Andriessen, J. (2011). Teaching and learning argumentative reading and writing: a review of research. Reading research quarterly, 46(3), 273–304. doi: 10.1598/RRQ.46.3.4

[36] Nguyen, M. T. T (2011). Learning to communicate in a globalized world: To what extent do school textbooks facilitate the development of intercultural pragmatic competence? RELC Journal, 42 (1), 17–30. doi: 10.1177/0033688210390265

[37] Niezgoda, K. & Röver, C. (2001). Pragmatics and grammatical awareness. A function of the learning environment. In K.R Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), Pragmatics in Language Teaching (pp. 63–102). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[38] Norenberg, M. (2016). Developing autonomous learners in the EFL classroom (Unpublished project paper). Department of Foreign Languages, University of Bergen

[39] Opsahl, P.C., & Johannessen, L.B. (2012). Forlag. Retrieved from https://snl.no/forlag

[40] Paltridge, B & Phakiti, A. (2015). Approaches and methods in applied linguistics. In B. Paltridge & A. Phakiti (Eds.), Research methods in applied linguistics. A practical resource (pp. 5–25). London: Bloomsbury.

[41] Richards J.C. (2006). Communicative language teaching today. New York: Cambridge University Press.

[42] Richards, J.C. & Rodgers, T.S. (2014). Approaches and methods in language teaching (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[43] Rindal, U. (2014). Questioning English standards: learner attitudes and L2 choices in Norway. Multilingua, 33(3), 313–334. https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2014-0015

[44] Rose, K.R. & Kasper, R. (2001). Pragmatics in language teaching. In K.R, Rose & R., Kasper (Eds.), Pragmatics in language teaching (pp.1–12). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[45] Samuda, V. & Bygate, M. (2008). Tasks in second language learning. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

[46] Sharma, P. & Barrett, B. (2007). Blended learning: Blended learning: using technology in and beyond the language classroom. Oxford: Macmillan

[47] Sheldon, L. E. (1987). ELT Textbooks and materials: Problems in evaluation and development. Great Britain: Modern English publications in association with the British council.

[48] Shumin, K. (2002). Factors to consider: Developing adult EFL students' speaking abilities. In J.C. Richards & W.A. Renandya (Eds.), Methodology in language teaching (pp. 204–211). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[49] Simensen, A. M (2007). Teaching a foreign language (2nd ed.). Bergen:

[50] Talleraas, T. (2014). Compliments on your competence (Masters' thesis). Department of Literature, Area Studies and European Languages, University of Oslo.

[51] Tateyama, Y. (2001). Explicit and implicit teaching of pragmatic routines. In K.R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), Pragmatics in language teaching (pp. 200–222). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. The Norwegian Publishers Association (2015). Bokmarkedet 2015. Retrieved from http://www.forleggerforeningen.no/statistikk-og-publikasjoner/statistikk/

[52] Vallenga, H. (2004) Learning pragmatics from ESL & EFL Textbooks: How likely? Teaching English as a second or foreign language, 8(2). Retrieved from http://tesl-ej.org/ej30/a3.html

[53] Van Ek, J./the Council of Europe (1986). Objectives for foreign language learning. Vol 1: Scope. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. Van Ek, J.A. & Trim J.L.M./the Council of Europe (1991). Threshold level 1990. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Press.

[54] Westgate, D. (1997). Precondition for successful small-group talk in the classroom. In B. Davies & D. Corson (Eds.), Encyclopedia of language and education (pp. 187–195). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

[55] Young, R. (1997). A critical- pragmatic theory of classroom talk. In B. Davies & D. Corson (Eds.), Encyclopedia of language and education (pp. 11–20). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.